

Historic, archived document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

MISCELLANEOUS BILLS

HEARING BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES UNITED STATES SENATE EIGHTY-FIFTH CONGRESS SECOND SESSION

ON

S. 3262

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN ACTIVITIES BY THE ARMED FORCES IN
SUPPORT OF THE VIII OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES

H. R. 3604

PROVIDING PENALTIES FOR INTERFERENCE WITH UTILITY LINES,
PANAMA CANAL ZONE

H. R. 5237

AUTHORIZING SECRETARY OF THE NAVY TO FURNISH SUPPLIES
AND SERVICES TO FOREIGN VESSELS AND AIRCRAFT

H. R. 6710

RELATING TO CANAL ZONE MONEY ORDERS WHICH REMAIN UNPAID

H. R. 6744

RELATING TO GRADUATE STUDY BY PERSONNEL OF THE NATIONAL
ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS

H. R. 7912

AUTHORIZING TRAILER ALLOWANCES TO DEPENDENTS IN THE
CASE OF THE DEATH OF A MEMBER OF THE ARMED SERVICES

FEBRUARY 27, 1958

Printed for the use of the Committee on Armed Services



UNITED STATES
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 1958

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Georgia, *Chairman*

HARRY FLOOD BYRD, Virginia

LYNDON B. JOHNSON, Texas

ESTES KEFAUVER, Tennessee

JOHN STENNIS, Mississippi

STUART SYMINGTON, Missouri

HENRY M. JACKSON, Washington

SAM J. ERVIN, Jr., North Carolina

LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Massachusetts

STYLES BRIDGES, New Hampshire

RALPH E. FLANDERS, Vermont

MARGARET CHASE SMITH, Maine

FRANCIS CASE, South Dakota

PRESCOTT BUSH, Connecticut

FRANK A. BARRETT, Wyoming

HARRY L. WINGATE, Jr., *Chief Clerk*

CONTENTS

Statements of—

S. 3262

Bible, Hon. Alan, United States Senator from the State of Nevada	Page 10
Francis, Hon. William H., Jr., Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower Personnel and Reserves	4
King, Robert L., executive director and general secretary, Organizing Committee, VIII Olympic Winter Games	4
Knowland, Hon. William F., United States Senator from the State of California	13

H. R. 3604

Whitman, W. M., Secretary, Panama Canal Company	21
---	----

H. R. 5237

Roberts, Capt. Thomas C., USN Supply Policy Section, Office of Chief of Naval Operations	26
---	----

H. R. 6710

Whitman, W. M., Secretary, Panama Canal Company	21
---	----

H. R. 6744

Dryden, Dr. Hugh L., Director, National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics	14
---	----

H. R. 7912

Vetter, Col. Fred W., Jr., Directorate of Personnel Planning, Office Deputy Chief of Staff, Department of the Air Force	23
--	----

MISCELLANEOUS BILLS

THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 1958

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, D. C.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:30 a. m., in room 212 Senate Office Building.

Present: Senators Russell (chairman), Kefauver, Stennis, Saltonstall, Smith, Case, Bush and Barrett.

Also present: Harry L. Wingate, Jr., chief clerk; William H. Darden, E. Edward Braswell, K. E. BeLieu and Herbert S. Atkinson of the committee staff.

Chairman RUSSELL. The committee will come to order.

The first bill for consideration this morning is S. 3262.

S. 3262

Chairman RUSSELL. S. 3262 is a proposal by the Department of Defense that was introduced in the Senate by a multiple and bipartisan sponsorship. The bill would authorize the Department of Defense to support the VIII Olympic Winter Games, to be held at Squaw Valley, Calif., in February 1960.

This support would be in the form of providing personnel, equipment, and supplies, and by providing a Federal grant for the construction of a sports arena on Government land in Squaw Valley.

A report from the Comptroller General suggesting several areas in which the bill might be more specific is available and will be placed before the members of the committee.

Without objection, a copy of the bill, a copy of the letter from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, dated February 10, 1958, requesting its introduction, and a copy of the report from the Comptroller General dated February 20, 1958, will be inserted in the record at this point.

(Documents referred to follows:)

[S. 3262, 85th Cong., 2d sess.]

A BILL To authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, (a) notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of a military department may, with respect to the VIII Olympic Winter Games—

(1) permit personnel of the Armed Forces under his jurisdiction to prepare courses, fields, and rinks, maintain avalanche control, and provide communications;

(2) lend necessary equipment; and

(3) provide such other support as he considers appropriate.

(b) The Secretary of the military department concerned may spend such funds for the purposes of this section as Congress may specifically appropriate for those purposes. He may acquire and utilize such supplies, material, and equipment as he determines to be necessary to provide the support authorized by this section.

(c) The authority provided to the Secretaries of the military departments by this section is permissive and not mandatory.

SEC. 2. Out of moneys appropriated by Congress for the specific purpose, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to the Organizing Committee, VIII Olympic Winter Games, Squaw Valley, California, U. S. A. 1960, Incorporated, a nonprofit corporation of the State of California, at its request, funds sufficient to construct, on land of the United States in Squaw Valley, Placer County, California, a sports arena suitable for the conduct of sports and appropriate ceremonies in connection with the VIII Olympic Winter Games. The expenditure of such funds by the Committee is subject to such audit as the Comptroller General of the United States may prescribe.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., February 20, 1958.

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
United States Senate.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Further reference is made to your letter of February 11, 1958, requesting a report on S. 3262. The bill would authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games and authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide funds to the organizing committee, VIII Olympic Winter Games, Squaw Valley, Calif., United States of America, 1960, Inc., at its request, to construct a sports arena.

Whether public funds should be made available to a private organization for expenditure such as is contemplated by section 2 of S. 3262 is a matter of policy peculiarly within the province of the Congress to decide. As a general rule we do not favor the enactment of this type of legislation, since private organizations (such as the organization committee) are not subject to the usual regulatory and prohibitory statutes governing the expenditure of public funds as in the case of Government agencies. However, in view of the unusual circumstances present here we have no objection to the instant bill although we do feel that it might be modified and clarified to some extent.

We would like to point out that neither section 1 nor section 2 of the bill contain a dollar limitation on the appropriation authorization or a time limitation on the availability of the funds. Also, as section 1 is now worded it appears that all costs incurred by the military departments in providing personnel and equipment of the Armed Forces for the support of the games, including the pay and allowances, subsistence, and travel of such personnel, and the cost of transporting the equipment to and from Squaw Valley, would have to be paid from the funds specifically appropriated for the purposes of section 1, and regular Department of Defense appropriations would not be available to pay such costs. However, we understand that it is estimated that 160 Army personnel and a smaller number of Navy personnel together with communications equipment, housekeeping supplies, and other equipment, will be provided by the Armed Forces under the authority of section 1 and that it is anticipated that \$500,000 will be necessary for the functions authorized by this section. It may be that \$500,000 would not be sufficient for the purposes of section 1 if the above specifically enumerated costs are to be paid therefrom, and that the Department of Defense contemplates paying such costs from its regular appropriations. If the Congress intends that the Department do this, it appears that section 1 should be modified to specifically so provide.

Concerning section 2, while it appears that under this section the Secretary of Defense may advance funds to the committee, instead of reimbursing it, the section does not specifically so provide. In view of section 3648, Revised Statutes, prohibiting advance payments, we feel that if it is the intent of the Congress that the funds be advanced to the committee such authority should be clearly spelled out. Also, while section 2 limits the total amount of funds the Secretary of Defense shall provide the committee to an amount "sufficient to construct" (i. e., the actual cost of construction), the sports arena, it does not limit the amount which may be advanced (if such is intended) at any one time. It may be that consideration should be given to limiting the funds which may be

advanced to the committee at any one time under section 2 to an amount sufficient to pay the progress or other payments on the arena construction falling due within the 2-month period immediately following the date of the advance.

Further, section 2 is silent as to who shall have title to the sports arena and as to its disposition after the games are over. We assume that title will vest in the United States since the arena will be constructed on land owned by the United States. However, we understand that the area containing the land on which the arena will be built has been leased to the State of California and that the State will operate this area as a State park after the games. In order to dispel any doubts concerning the title to the arena, we feel that section 2 should specifically provide that title shall vest in the United States, if that is what is intended.

We would also like to point out that while under the audit language in section 2 the expenditure of the funds is subject to such audit as we may prescribe, since the organizing committee is not a Government organization our audit responsibility would be limited to determining whether the committee's accounts fully and fairly reflect its expenditures and whether the funds were spent for the purposes for which appropriated.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

(The letter of February 10, 1958, referred to follows:)

Hon. RICHARD NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is inclosed a draft of proposed legislation "to authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes."

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1958 and it has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. It is recommended that the proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation is designed to enable the Department of Defense to support the conduct of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, to be held at Squaw Valley, Calif., during February 1960. Because of the difficulties peculiar to staging winter games in such mountainous areas, military support is required.

By the joint resolution of June 13, 1955, chapter 138 (69 Stat. 131), the Congress invited the International Olympic Committee to hold the VIII Olympic Winter games in Squaw Valley. This invitation was accepted and the United States has the responsibility of acting as host nation at those games.

Section 1 authorizes the Department of Defense to assist the VIII Olympic Winter Games Organizing Committee by providing personnel, equipment, and supplies for the preparation of courses, fields, and rinks; avalanche control; communications; transportation (through the use of special vehicles designed to operate in heavy snow); and snow compaction; and for the loan of communications equipment and housekeeping supplies.

To provide this support, it will be necessary to move military personnel and equipment to Squaw Valley and establish an Arctic tent camp for quartering, feeding, and administering this group separate from their parent installations. It is estimated that 160 Army personnel and a smaller number of Navy personnel will be required.

For a number of years, the Armed Forces have been engaged in research and training for operations in mountain and cold weather conditions and are capable of providing the required assistance with a minimum of orientation and training. In addition, some training benefits will be derived in providing this support.

So far as they relate to military support and participation, preparation for the VIII Olympic Winter Games, actual conduct of the games, and the closing out of facilities will cover a period of approximately 60 days.

Section 2 authorizes the organizing committee of the VIII Olympic Winter Games to construct a suitable sports arena on Government land in Squaw Valley for use in connection with the VIII Olympic Winter Games and requires the Secretary of Defense to provide funds therefor out of moneys appropriated by Congress for the specific purpose. As a permanent memorial of those games,

this arena would be available for sports on a continuing basis. The United States has leased the area to the State of California, which will operate it as a State park consistently with the policy of Federal-State use of public land for recreational purposes.

This legislation, relating as it does to only special kinds of support, is intended to be in addition to, and independent of, any provision of existing permanent law respecting the training, attendance, or participation of athletes in the Olympic games, or other international competition generally.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this proposed legislation will result in an aggregate increased cost to the Department of Defense of not in excess of \$4 million during fiscal year 1958 through fiscal year 1960. It is anticipated that \$3.5 million of this amount will be necessary for the construction of the sports area authorized by section 2, and that the \$3.5 million probably will be a supplemental request for fiscal year 1958. The remaining one-half million dollars will be necessary for the support functions authorized by section 1 of the proposed legislation and probably will be requested for fiscal year 1960.

Sincerely yours,

(Signed) DONALD A. QUARLES, *Deputy*.

Chairman RUSSELL. The first witness on the bill is Hon. William H. Francis, Jr., Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower Personnel and Reserves. Mr. Francis, we will be glad to have you make such statement as you see fit at this time.

Mr. Robert L. King, executive director and general secretary of the Organizing Committee VIII Olympic Winter Games is present and available to answer any questions relating to the activities of the committee.

STATEMENTS OF HON. WILLIAM H. FRANCIS, JR., ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR MANPOWER PERSONNEL AND RESERVES; AND ROBERT L. KING, EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR AND GENERAL SECRETARY ORGANIZING COMMITTEE VIII OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES

Before the Assistant Secretary begins, Senator Bible, did you want to make a statement first?

Senator BIBLE. Thank you Mr. Chairman and members of the committee. I do have a short statement to make in support of this bill after Secretary Francis has completed.

Chairman RUSSELL. Very well. Would you proceed, Mr. Secretary?

Mr. FRANCIS. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, I am very happy to be here this morning to speak on behalf of S. 3262, a bill to authorize certain activities by the armed forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes. The Department of Defense, representing the executive branch of the Government, strongly endorses this bill.

Section 1 of S. 3262 would authorize the Department of Defense to assist in the conduct of the VIII Olympic Winter Games by providing personnel, equipment and supplies for the preparation of courses, fields, and rinks; avalanche control; certain communications and transportation assistance; and snow compaction. It would also authorize the loan of communications equipment and housekeeping supplies.

In this connection I should point out that the Department of Defense would not engage in the actual construction of facilities. How-

ever, it would provide technical advice and assistance such as high altitude course patrols. As you know, the military departments have had unique experience with respect to these areas and it should prove very beneficial in carrying out the Olympic games program.

To provide this support, it will be necessary to move military personnel and equipment to Squaw Valley and establish an Arctic tent camp for quartering, feeding, and administering this group separate from their parent installations. It is estimated that approximately 160 Army personnel and a smaller number of Navy personnel will be required.

Section 2 of the bill, as you know, authorizes the construction of a suitable sports arena on Government land in Squaw Valley for use in connection with the VIII Olympic Winter Games and it requires the Secretary of Defense to provide funds therefor out of moneys appropriated by the Congress for this specific purpose.

It is estimated that 1,000 athletes and some 200 foreign newspapermen from some 37 nations will be our guests. Speaking for the executive branch of the Government, we believe that, since the United States will be the host nation, this opportunity of having in our country so many young athletes and newspaper people from other nations will return large dividends through the opportunity it will afford to have them see and learn, at first hand, democracy in action. As you know, the President has taken special recognition of this matter by including a specific request in his 1959 budget message.

I am sure you will agree that our welcome must be the best that this country can provide. The executive branch of the Government has also been impressed by the fact that the State of California is bearing the major cost. Favorable consideration of this bill, together with the support being given by the State of California will, we believe, not only provide the proper facilities but help to create the good will and atmosphere of good sportsmanship that is so necessary to maintaining the spirit of the Olympic games.

This coupled with the fact that our country has extended an official invitation to the participating nations, leads us to believe that this is a most worthy undertaking. The executive branch of the Government strongly recommends favorable consideration of this measure.

In connection with the Comptroller General's letter here, he made several points which we would want to comment on now, with the permission of the Chair.

Chairman RUSSELL. All right, sir, go ahead.

Mr. FRANCIS. I believe that the first point of the letter from the Comptroller General pointed out that the bill contained no dollar limitation and no time limitation.

It is contemplated that the total money to be appropriated would be approximately \$4 million, and if it is the desire of this committee to put that maximum in this bill, that would be acceptable.

Of course, when we go to the Appropriations Committee to ask for money, it could be limited, but the request would be for approximately \$4 million. I believe \$3,481,000 is estimated for construction and \$500,000 is estimated for the other activities, the support activities of the Army and Navy.

We do not feel that a time limitation is necessary. This bill, S. 3262, does provide that the purpose is for these games to be held in February

1960 and we believe that contributes a time limitation, but if the committee wanted to add a specific time limitation as to the cutoff date of the availability, of course, there would be no objection.

The second point that was made raises the question as to whether there were to be additional costs to the services for participation and if so whether they were to be paid for out of this authorization or out of the general authorization of Public Law 11, which authorizes general participation by the services, in the winter Olympics.

Any participation by members of the Armed Forces as athletic competitors, and the military doubtless will participate, will be paid not by this authorization or appropriation, but by the general authorization of the other law, i. e. Public Law 11 of the 84th Congress.

We believe this bill, S. 3262, as written, actually does state the purpose. It authorizes a specific appropriation for these specific support activities, and this construction; and then, out of our general authorization, we would pay the cost of the participation of our athletes.

The third point that the Comptroller General made in his letter is that there was no provision for advance payments on the construction contract.

There is no desire to have advance payments. We would probably use the procedure of making partial payments during the process of the construction.

The fourth point made by the Comptroller General is that the bill is silent as to who shall have the title to the sports arena and as to its disposition after the games are over.

This is on Federal land which is under long-term lease to the State and I am sure that under the general law of ownership the title would remain in the United States Government subject to leasing to the State for 30 years.

The last comment of the Comptroller General was that the bill only provided an obligation on the Comptroller to audit to determine whether the committee's accounts reflected the expenditures and whether the funds were spent for the purpose of the act.

I believe that was informationally only, to get on the record what the obligation was. I believe that the audit would be adequate for the purpose, that they would audit to see whether the construction money was spent for the purposes of the act.

I believe those are the five points in the Comptroller General's letter.

Chairman RUSSELL. Do you happen to know whether or not the funds that have been made available by the State of California are turned over to this committee, or are they expended by the State?

Mr. FRANCIS. Most of them are expended by the State and a large part of the State expenditure is on the road construction and they are spending that directly.

I am sure that some additional is turned over to this committee for budget purposes. Mr. King is here and he can go into that.

There is a State agency created for this event, called the State Olympic Commission, which would expend the State funds—this organizing committee would not expend any of the State funds.

Mr. KING. State funds are expended on the recommendation of the organizing committee.

Chairman RUSSELL. What check does the Department of Defense have on this private corporation?

Mr. FRANCIS. It is a nonprofit organization.

Chairman RUSSELL. I understand that, but what checks do you have on the expenditure of these funds?

Mr. FRANCIS. I believe that the Department is planning to handle this just as the Army engineers would handle their civil construction, and we would enter into an agreement with this committee whereby they would contract the work and we would make partial payments on the work as it was completed on receipt of evidence that the money had been expended, with a holding back of some percentage, I don't know how much. Usually, I believe, it is about 25 percent that would be held up until final completion.

Chairman RUSSELL. Who is going to see that the work is done according to the specifications? Are the Army engineers going to do anything with that or are you going to depend on the Olympic committee?

Mr. FRANCIS. I believe it is the intention for us not to supervise the work, that we would rely on the certificate of completion of the architect, and rely on the committee for satisfactory completion, and, of course, the Comptroller would audit the account.

Chairman RUSSELL. Well, he does not give the same kind of audit that he does for Federal expenditures, according to his own letter. He says the only thing he determines is whether or not they have spent the money.

I am not reflecting on the gentlemen who compose this committee. I know that they are all men of the highest possible type but this is a little unusual. I want to check the Federal expenditures as far as we can.

Mr. FRANCIS. Yes, sir; I think we certainly should and if it is desired to have a more complete audit by the Comptroller, certainly we would not object to it.

Chairman RUSSELL. Any questions, Senator Smith?

Senator SMITH. No questions.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Stennis?

Senator STENNIS. Well, Mr. Chairman; yes.

I do not understand just who owns this land now, Mr. Secretary. Is this national forest land?

Mr. FRANCIS. It is owned by the United States Government and administered by the United States Department of Agriculture under a long-term lease to the State of California.

Senator STENNIS. Under a long-term lease?

Mr. FRANCIS. That is right.

Senator STENNIS. This is national parks land?

Mr. FRANCIS. This is forest land.

Senator STENNIS. Well, what was your construction that you were going to do, what type of building?

Mr. FRANCIS. Well, there is a large arena, there will be these inside activities and of course there would be some temporary buildings for housing, but the permanent building is the arena, and I take it that all of this money goes into the arena construction, this \$3,400,000 is for the arena.

Senator STENNIS. Well, if it is under a 30-year lease to the State of California, they would control it, then, over the years. Do you

not think there ought to be some special arrangements made about it? If we are going to put up this construction there, we will virtually lose control over it during the life of the lease unless some arrangement is made.

Mr. FRANCIS. Yes, sir; and it would have to remain under the terms in the State, it is true, and we are putting a very valuable improvement there at the cost of the Federal Government.

Senator STENNIS. I am not adverse to the idea of having the Olympics in the United States and at this particular spot, if it happens to be a suitable spot—and of course I am no judge of that—but why should you call on the services to spend their money and prepare all of these fields and ski runs and so forth—why call upon the services to do that?

Mr. FRANCIS. With respect to the construction job, the \$3,400,000, the Defense Department is actually going to be used as a conduit for dispensing the money so that there is no imposition on the personnel of the services in the construction.

Now, on some of the others, they are unique services; the controls and the communication that they can provide, it would be very difficult to get that anywhere else.

That would take about 160 Army personnel with a smaller number of Navy people.

I think that the Navy is going to do some snow compacting there which they were going to do anyway.

Senator STENNIS. Would this be a bona fide military maneuver or training by these men? If that is so, then that is material.

The point I am making is that we are considering these pay bills and everybody has been talking about keeping men in the services and obtaining the highest type of men. I do not see quite the purpose here, where you are coming in and taking men and using them for these purposes as outlined in this bill.

Mr. FRANCIS. Of course, these are special troops trained for mountain work. I believe at this time they are in Alaska and their normal activities are training for mountain work.

Senator STENNIS. Can you assure the committee that whatever personnel the armed services use would be used only in connection with matters that pertain directly to their specialized training?

Mr. FRANCIS. Yes, sir; that will be true. It will be people that are good skiers, and they will control and run the communications on this long ski run. The communications will be pretty difficult.

Senator STENNIS. Well, I just want a general guaranty by you that their activities will be limited.

Mr. FRANCIS. That is right. They will not be used in general service type of work that could be just as easily provided by civilians or State employees.

Senator STENNIS. Would they be used only in connection with their specific line of military training?

Mr. FRANCIS. That is right; their special training as mountain troops.

Senator STENNIS. Military training?

Mr. FRANCIS. Yes, sir.

Senator STENNIS. What was that you said a while ago about athletes competing from the services? I would want them to compete, of course, but I do not see where that comes into this bill.

Mr. FRANCIS. It does not at all. That was something the Comptroller General raised, and the Comptroller just raised that question because there is a general authorization, Public Law 11, I believe passed in 1955, which authorizes the services to use their general appropriations to send their boys to any of the Olympic games. Under that authority they can continue to pay the same allowances to these boys and transportation so they can actively participate.

Senator STENNIS. I believe this is in the Lake Tahoe country. It is a wonderful place. I went through there. I did not have time to tarry, but I was very much interested, tremendously impressed with the layout there. That is all, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Barrett?

Senator BARRETT. Yes, Mr. Chairman. You say that men from the services would compete in the Olympics?

Mr. FRANCIS. Yes, sir.

Senator BARRETT. Now, this particular arrangement as covered by this bill, is this the first time that we have entered into this kind of a deal in this country?

Mr. FRANCIS. I believe that when we had the Olympic games many years ago, in late 1932, I believe—this is the second time, but this is the first time on this scale.

Senator BARRETT. Tell me, will this area be open to the public during this 30-year period of the lease?

Mr. FRANCIS. Yes, sir. That is in the Government lease, it will have to be used as a State park open to the public.

Senator BARRETT. How much of this is the State of California and how much the State of Nevada, I mean, how much are they contributing to this enterprise?

Mr. FRANCIS. Nevada has already committed \$200,000 directly and will probably contribute more.

California is spending \$43 million on roads and have committed another \$8 million which they are expending directly, so they are paying the bulk of the cost.

Senator BARRETT. And I presume that if this facility is established there, it will be used in connection with winter sports, I assume, from now on out?

Mr. FRANCIS. Yes, sir.

Senator BARRETT. Will there be also an opportunity available for the services for any training purposes that they want to use it for?

Mr. FRANCIS. Well, Senator, I doubt that we have the legal right. Perhaps we do, but I doubt it, unless it is in the lease. I doubt whether we have the legal right to use it for military maneuvers.

Senator BARRETT. Is that terrain adaptable for that purpose?

Mr. FRANCIS. It might be, although actually the Army at the moment and for the next 2 or 3 years is planning to do most of that type of training in Alaska; but some of this terrain would be adaptable.

Senator BARRETT. That would be my recollection of that area, and I assume that this area would be quite suitable for that purpose.

In other words, the investment, the capital there, the expenditure of \$3,400,000 is going to be in the nature of a permanent facility that the States of California and Nevada will obtain and it will be open and available to the services if they wanted it; is that your understanding?

Mr. FRANCIS. That is right. This basic lease to the State is, of course, part of the policy that has been followed in many of these areas where the Federal Government owns so much, they lease the property to the States, and the usual provision is in there requiring that it be kept open as a public park.

Senator BARRETT. Mr. Secretary, I realize that this is a little bit out of your field, but Senator Bible and myself are on the Interior Committee and we authorize tremendous expenditures for public purposes such as parks, recreation facilities, reserves in the forests, and so on. I assume that this certainly could come within that category; and it would be suitable for the services. That is all I have to say. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. If there are no further questions, we would like to hear you, Senator Bible, if you care to add anything.

STATEMENT OF HON. ALAN BIBLE, UNITED STATES SENATOR FROM THE STATE OF NEVADA

Senator BIBLE. Thank you very much, Senator, and members of the committee. I think that the Secretary, Mr. Francis, has covered the main points before the committee and has answered the questions of the members of the committee very well, in my opinion.

I simply want to add my word of endorsement as cosponsor of this particular Senate bill.

It does seem to me that this is an area here where Federal assistance is justified. As has been pointed out by the Secretary this is authorizing legislation to enable personnel of the armed services who are skilled in this winter work, which is a specialized type of work, cold-weather work, to further their training in that field.

The Army has indicated its willingness to use ski troops in this area. The Navy, of course, as Mr. Francis has pointed out, wants to carry on some of its snow-compacting tests. I think that that in itself is justification for participation in this.

I might add that this is one of the great winter sport areas of the United States. My interest was directed to this particular area. I am very familiar with it. It is near Lake Tahoe, a lake on the boundary line and this particular area is in California.

My attention was first directed to it when the American Olympic Committee selected Squaw Valley as the place to hold the 1960 Olympics, and when they went to put in their bid at the International Olympic Committee for the United States, the choice was backed up by a Senate resolution approved on June 13, 1955, resolving that the Senate and the House of Representatives join with the United States Olympic Association in inviting the International Olympic Committee to hold the next Olympic games in the United States, in Squaw Valley, Calif., in 1960.

It seems to me that this is a great opportunity for a great deal of good to be accomplished, to come from this joint relationship and international goodwill and understanding between the people of different countries.

After that resolution they went forward and Squaw Valley of California was proposed and was successful and it was selected.

As has been pointed out already, the State of California has already appropriated \$8 million in commitments to carry forward the winter Olympics of 1960.

My own State of Nevada appropriated \$200,000, I believe that was indicated, and they are willing to contribute at least that much more.

These States will become gateways to thousands of visitors from all over the world and they are fully aware, that is the States are, of the responsible role that they play—and the sums that I mention are those sums that go directly to the Olympic committee.

In addition to that, there has been considerable priority given in some of the forest services to open up the area to make it the greatest Olympics of all time and we sincerely believe that they will be.

This is not just a one-shot proposition. There will be preliminary events that take place in 1959 and after 1960 this will become a vast State park in California under the terms of the 30-year lease.

It will add one more showplace in the scenic grandeur of America.

So for all of these considerations, we feel that the legislation, Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee, is worthwhile and is completely justified and we hope that favorable action will be given, which will give confidence to the many people who are working hard to make the Olympics of 1960 an outstanding international event.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Bush, do you desire to ask Assistant Secretary Francis any questions?

Senator BUSH. No, sir, thank you.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Kefauver?

Senator KEFAUVER. Mr. Chairman, has it been stated what will be done with the stadium after the games?

Chairman RUSSELL. The land belongs to the Forest Service.

Senator KEFAUVER. I understand that.

Chairman RUSSELL. The State of California will have it under a long-term lease and there will be a State park operated by the State of California after the Olympics.

Senator KEFAUVER. I have no questions.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Stennis?

Senator STENNIS. Did you say that \$43 million was being spent by the State of California for roads?

Senator BIBLE. That is my understanding of approximately the correct figure.

Senator STENNIS. For this program?

Senator BIBLE. On this particular—on the roads alone, let us differentiate—I am sure that this is correct, that \$8 million is going directly to the Olympics.

Senator BARRETT. Is the State of California and the State of Nevada putting up any money for this facility or is this \$3,400,000 the total cost?

Mr. FRANCIS. The Federal Government is putting up the total cost of the arena.

Chairman RUSSELL. I might say that the State of California is building dormitories and things of that kind in connection with it. Is that not right, Mr. King?

Mr. KING. Yes.

Senator BARRETT. They are putting in some money?

Mr. FRANCIS. Oh, yes, some \$8 million has been committed in construction.

Senator BARRETT. In addition to the road?

Mr. FRANCIS. That is right. There is an Olympic village that the State is paying for and this \$8 million is directly expended by the State of California over and above the road cost and they have done, of course, quite a bit of construction.

Senator BARRETT. Will it become the property of the United States?

Mr. FRANCIS. Eventually, after this 30-year lease runs out.

Chairman RUSSELL. Well, I think that we can reasonably assume that the State of California will operate a great State park for winter sports there for some time, until the end of the lease, at least.

From my own viewpoint the only reason I am willing to support this bill, which is really a substantial assistance to a State park that under ordinary circumstances ought to be financed by State funds, is the fact that they are having the Olympics out there. This, I think, justifies our taking some action on this.

Are there any further questions?

Senator BUSH. Has the Government in any prior years when the Olympics have been held, made any contributions of this nature?

Chairman RUSSELL. No, sir. I think this is the first time we have something of this nature.

Are there any further questions?

(No response.)

Chairman RUSSELL. That was from my information, Senator: you gentlemen are better informed.

Mr. FRANCIS. I believe that is correct. I believe that in 1949 they did pass an authorization bill for the Pan-American games but it never cleared the Appropriations Committee.

Chairman RUSSELL. We have other arena authorizations but never any appropriations; one at Cleveland and other places.

Mr. KING. I may add that public housing funds were used in 1932 in Los Angeles for the purpose of the Olympic games—I do not know the background, but that is an indication that something of that nature has been done.

Chairman RUSSELL. If that was done through public housing funds, of course, after the expiration of the games, whatever construction there was reverted to ordinary public housing purposes?

Mr. KING. That is right.

Chairman RUSSELL. Which is somewhat different from this because there is no reversion of facilities.

Are there any further questions?

(No response.)

Chairman RUSSELL. I want to say for the record that Senator Knowland has been very anxious to appear this morning on behalf of this bill and was deterred in other work.

Senator BUSH. Is he in favor of it?

Chairman RUSSELL. I rather assume that he might be inclined to support it, Senator Bush; he is one of the authors, and I might say that he did a great job for his State; I never saw the kind of bill like this which came here that had every department of Government coming in and recommending it.

At any rate, Senator Knowland will submit a statement later to the committee.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
March 3, 1958.

HON. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Senate Armed Services Committee,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: As a cosponsor of S. 3262 I am writing to urge favorable consideration of this legislation by your committee.

As you know, this legislation would authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of VIII Olympic Winter Games and authorize the Secretary of Defense to furnish funds to the organizing committee, VIII Olympic Winter Games, Squaw Valley, to construct a sports arena. The proposed legislation would enable the Department of Defense to support the conduct of the 1960 winter games. Such support is required because of the inherent difficulties in staging these winter games in such mountainous areas.

Since this country was selected to be the host nation for these winter games, it is important to our position overseas that adequate facilities for these athletic contests be provided.

The proposed legislation is part of the Department of Defense's legislative program for 1958, and it has received the approval of the Bureau of the Budget. At the same time the Comptroller General of the United States has indicated that his office has no objection to the bill.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND.

(Subsequently, in executive session, the committee voted to report the bill favorably, with amendments, as covered by S. Rept 1342).

H. R. 6744

Chairman RUSSELL. The next bill for consideration is H. R. 6744. (H. R. 6744 is as follows:)

[H. R. 6744, 85th Cong., 1st sess.]

AN ACT To amend Public Law 472, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, relative to the attendance of professional personnel of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics in graduate schools

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 6 of Public Law 472, Eighty-first Congress, as amended by Public Law 352, Eighty-third Congress, is amended to read "The total of the sums expended each year pursuant to this Act shall not exceed two percent of the total salaries paid to NACA professional employees during the fiscal year."

Passed the House of Representatives May 20, 1957.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS, *Clerk.*

Chairman RUSSELL. H. R. 6744 is a proposal by the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics. The purpose of this bill is increase a limitation on the amount the NACA may spend in continuing the salaries of its scientific and professional personnel while they attend graduate schools.

The limitation is now \$100,000 per year. It was raised to this amount in the 83d Congress after having been first established at \$50,000 per year in 1950.

The bill before us would permit expenditures for this purpose in an amount not to exceed 2 percent of the total salaries paid to NACA professional employees during the fiscal year.

The witness on this bill is Dr. Hugh L. Dryden, Director, of the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics.

**STATEMENT OF DR. HUGH L. DRYDEN, DIRECTOR, NATIONAL
ADVISORY COMMITTEE FOR AERONAUTICS**

MR. DRYDEN. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity of appearing before the committee in support of this bill. It does not involve the appropriation of any additional funds but increases the present limitations on the funds available for the support of additional graduate study and training of our personnel.

We have approximately 2,400 professional people. The total professional payroll is approximately \$20 million out of a total payroll of \$50 million.

We trained about 200 people in the fiscal year 1957. The total average graduate leave time per individual was about 12 man days per year at an average cost of \$500. There are a very few people who might be trained for longer periods for \$1,000 and a few others who may be given a special course of a week or two or less than 12 days. The average cost per individual has been \$500. This has taken, as you can see from these amounts, about one-half of 1 percent of our man-years.

The proposal before us is to increase the limitation and put it on the basis of 2 percent which would amount to approximately \$400,000 as compared with the \$100,000 in the present limitation.

I have a statement which I can read or I can put it in the record.

Chairman RUSSELL. We will have it printed in the record.

(The statement referred to is as follows:)

Nearly 8 years ago the NACA was authorized by the 81st Congress, under Public Law 472, to grant leaves of absence so that professional personnel could attend, at their own expense, accredited universities for graduate research and study in order to increase the value of their services to the Government. The original limitation on this program was \$50,000 in salaries for such leave in any 1 year. In 1954 Public Law 472 was amended to increase this limitation to \$100,000 per year. H. R. 6744, now before you, changes the limitation from the fixed dollar amount of \$100,000 per year to 2 percent of the total annual salaries of the NACA professional personnel.

During the past 8 years NACA has granted leave for university graduate study and research in science and engineering to over 600 different professional employees. Most of the grants of leave were for cumulative periods of a few weeks each, a few for longer periods, and in half of the cases the employees supplemented their official leave with leave without pay for 50 percent of the period. At present 80 percent of the individuals under the program are granted graduate leave a few hours a day away from NACA laboratories to take specialized graduate study at nearby universities. This has made it possible to increase the number of trained individuals with a minimum of interruption to research work. We have found the specialized study to be of notable value in advancing our research work and in economically developing additional knowledge and skill of our scientists. On the basis of this experience, we find that it would be in the public interest to do more training instead of less and less training which is now the case.

The graduate study leave program has been extremely successful in several ways. Our recruiters tell us that this graduate-study program is one of the most valuable assets in attracting talented young science and engineering graduates to employment with the NACA. As NACA research salaries have lagged further behind those paid by industry, the graduate-leave program has been of material aid in our effort to recruit and retain scientific personnel.

The graduate study leave program increases the skills and knowledge of our scientific staff to perform their research duties more ef-

It seems to me there ought to be some system whereby there would be a clearinghouse where we would get the benefit of all their thinking.

Mr. DRYDEN. Well, Senator, we serve to some extent for this purpose because we have a series of advisory committees and subcommittees whose membership is partly government, partly industry and partly military.

There are about 500 or so people who serve on these committees without compensation, apart from their travel expenses, and these people meet and talk about technical matters.

I think what you are concerned with is a slightly different question, which is the actual development projects that are approved.

Senator BARRETT. I will tell you what I have in mind. Dr. von Braun has about 160 scientists working at Redstone and in California they are doing a big scientific job under General Schriever, and the Navy has a program, and they are all working independently, as I see it.

It seems to me that if we could bring them together and let them use their brains collectively we would accomplish a lot more, somehow or other.

Mr. DRYDEN. I think there is much more interchange of scientific information between them than is ordinarily realized, and the problem is a matter of how many missile development projects, for example, you have in the same service, and in other services.

You have General Schriever dealing with the missile development project, the Thor and the Atlas, and the Titan, and then you have the Army dealing with the Jupiter, and you now have one dealing with the Polaris program in the Navy, Senator.

However, the scientists do get together and exchange views, though they are working on work related to different development projects.

We are involved in all these I have mentioned. I do not mean to say we are a large percentage of it or anything of that sort, but we are doing jobs connected with the Jupiter and the Polaris and the Titan and the rest of them, using facilities and the people that we have.

When Polaris was first set up, for example, the Navy asked us to lend them a technical expert to work on the committee that made the general specifications, in this instance the nose cone. That committee got together and they selected a shape of nose cone which was the result of prior research that we had been doing, and this man still sits with this committee and he follows through.

As I say, I do not pretend that the money we are spending or the effort that we are expending is a major share of any of these missiles programs, but there is much more contact than I think you see from the outside as you look about in these missiles projects.

Senator BARRETT. And the name of your agency is the National Advisory Committee for Aeronautics?

Mr. DRYDEN. Yes, sir; more commonly known as NACA.

Senator BARRETT. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. I might say, Senator Barrett, when I first came on the Committee on Appropriations 25 years ago I was of the opinion that this organization was sort of a fifth wheel. I could not see where it had any place in the scheme of things, because the Army had

vast research programs, and the private aeronautic business had great research, and even CAB had some, and, of course, we have got the Navy with tremendous research in the field of aviation; but it seems that if you take it up with any of these people that are doing research, they immediately claim that Dr. Dryden's organization is of tremendous importance, and whether it is just to get together, or whatever, they are apparently important.

Mr. DRYDEN. Mr. Chairman, if I may use an analogy, the architect or engineer who designs a bridge or a building gets a very small amount of the credit for it. It is very hard to see exactly what he does. It is the contractor that builds it, and you will never find a missile or an airplane or a ship except perhaps one of our test planes which will have "NACA" on it.

And as an illustration, the 102 and the B-52 were two airplanes which were literally saved because of the work of the NACA. They were not reaching their performance and the projects were just about to be canceled when we came through with aid to enable them to develop their performance.

We find that we are much more effective in doing our job if we do not go around trying to compete for the headlines.

Senator STENNIS. And I may say, Mr. Chairman, that a few years ago you had a building program for Dr. Dryden's organization here before the subcommittee, and we were most favorably impressed indeed with the modesty and the way he was making ends meet, and the tremendous work that he was doing, too, and the building program out there was of very far-reaching significance—fine work.

One more question, Mr. Chairman, about this Viscount.

Dr. Dryden, you say that there are four 1,000-horsepower engines. Taking the DC-4, that has four engines, too, or what do they have—what does the DC-7 have?

Mr. DRYDEN. The DC-7 I think has four 3,500-horsepower engines, something of that kind.

Senator STENNIS. And the old DC-4, what did it have?

Mr. DRYDEN. I don't recall about the DC-4, probably four 1,800.

Senator STENNIS. I see. That is quite different.

Chairman RUSSELL. Thank you, Dr. Dryden.

(Subsequently, in executive session, the committee voted to report the bill favorably, without amendment, as covered by S. Rept. 1329.)

H. R. 3604 AND H. R. 6710

Chairman RUSSELL. We next have two bills that relate to the operations of the Panama Canal Zone.

H. R. 3604 is a proposal by the Canal Zone Government. This bill proposes to extend and broaden existing law against willful or malicious interference with public utility installations in the Panama Canal Zone.

This would be accomplished by amending the Canal Zone Code to make it a felony to injure or destroy public utility installations.

H. R. 6710 is another proposal by the Canal Zone Government. This bill would establish a 20-year statute of limitations on the payment of money orders issued by the Canal Zone Government. Approval of the bill apparently would result in approximately \$29,000 being recovered into the United States Treasury, and it would also

fectively. It becomes especially valuable at this time when we cannot, due to inadequate Government pay scales, recruit or retain sufficient numbers of scientists and engineers, that we utilize those we have to the greatest degree possible.

During the past several years the salaries of the individuals granted such leave have increased due to increases in the pay schedules of the Classification Act and, more recently, due to the increases granted under the recruiting above-the-minimum provisions of section 803 of the Classification Act for positions in shortage categories. These salary increases have resulted in a substantial reduction of the amount of leave granted for graduate training, due to the fixed dollar ceiling in the act.

The amendment now being considered provides that the dollar limitation be changed to a percentage of the total salaries paid to our professional staff. The purpose of this change is to allow a needed increase in the program and relate the amount of graduate training to changes in the size of the NACA.

This graduate-study program is modest in scope. In fact in fiscal 1958 it is estimated that only a total of about 10 man-years of graduate training will be granted.

This proposed legislation is noncontroversial, is in the public interest, and will provide for granting of additional leaves of absence without expense to the Government for tuition, travel, subsistence, or academic expenses, and will not require any increase in NACA appropriations.

Mr. DRYDEN. I will now stop for your questions.

Chairman RUSSELL. Any questions, Senator Smith?

Senator SMITH. No questions.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Stennis?

Senator STENNIS. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

I think I understand the purpose of this. I know that we have had contacts with Dr. Dryden here before and I know the fine work he is doing.

I would like to know, Doctor, these men you are talking about being on leave, you refer to them as doing this scientific work. Is that above the graduate level, that is, they already have bachelor's degrees?

Mr. DRYDEN. They already have their bachelor's degrees and I should make it clear that the tuition is at the expense of the employee. This is the granting of leave with pay. In other words, at present we do not pay the tuition.

Senator STENNIS. They pay the tuition?

Mr. DRYDEN. Yes.

Senator STENNIS. And you merely carry them on the payroll; and how long does that continue on the average?

Mr. DRYDEN. About 12 days per year for the average.

Senator STENNIS. You mean that that is all, 12 days is all the time you carry them for this extra training?

Mr. DRYDEN. What I am trying to say, we try to distribute the opportunity, particularly for training in any subjects, short-term training courses, as widely as we can within the limitation we now have.

Senator STENNIS. I believe that is all, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Bush?

Senator BUSH. I do not quite understand that, Doctor. I am not familiar with this program so I am not as well acquainted as the other gentlemen and Mrs. Smith would be.

You mean that you release a man for 12 days, a course of 12 days in something?

Mr. DRYDEN. This is the average period. There are many special lecture courses that may be given in a new field, say, in rocket propulsion or, at the present time, there are subjects connected with State universities, such as the University of Virginia which, for example, is close to our Langley Laboratory. In California, at the Ames Laboratory, it is Stanford University, and they will have short-term courses. I think there are a very few people that we may release for a full semester.

This is an average figure, we have very few for full semesters and sometimes special cases of a special course.

Now, I am not trying to mislead you when I am speaking about a 12-day period, because, for example, in the laboratory of Stanford University, they are being given in the late afternoon and so this time may be spread over a few hours a day or a few days a week over a long period. In other words, we are releasing a man early from his job to go over to Stanford to take the afternoon courses, so that the 12 days then might extend over a long period.

Senator BUSH. Where is your place located?

Mr. DRYDEN. Moffett Field, Calif., Mountain View.

Senator BUSH. What is the personnel?

Mr. DRYDEN. The total NACA personnel is approximately 7,700 people, located primarily in Moffett Field, Calif.; Cleveland, Ohio; and Langley Field, Va.; and about 3,200 people roughly in Langley, and about 1,300 at Mountain View; 2,600 at Cleveland. I will put the exact figures in the record, I am just giving you a rough idea.

(The figures referred to are as follows:)

NACA employment, as of Feb. 27, 1958

NACA headquarters, Washington, D. C.....	165
Langley Aeronautical Laboratory, Langley Field, Va.....	3,179
Ames Aeronautical Laboratory, Mountain View, Calif.....	1,408
Lewis Flight Propulsion Laboratory, Cleveland, Ohio.....	2,646
High-speed-flight station, Edwards, Calif.....	294
Pilotless aircraft research station, Wallops Island, Va.....	81
Western Coordination Office, Los Angeles, Calif.....	4
Liaison office, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Dayton, Ohio.....	2
Total.....	7,779

Senator BUSH. Thank you.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Kefauver?

Senator KEFAUVER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Dr. Dryden, you have stated that over a period of 8 or 9 years 600 different personnel, professional employees have been afforded some opportunity for further study.

Mr. DRYDEN. That is the total participation.

Senator KEFAUVER. And what will be the participation under this new bill?

Mr. DRYDEN. We have about 2,500 employees and 2 percent of 2,500 is about 50 people for the year. You see, that is a cumulative figure that you have over 8 years.

Senator KEFAUVER. I mean, per year, how many do you think will be taking the courses?

Mr. DRYDEN. I have the figures. In 1956 there were 145 and in 1957 there were 206 and this would enable us to go up to something in the order of 4 times as many people for the short courses, or somewhat better training for a fewer number of people.

Senator KEFAUVER. As I understand it, this would enable you to pay them their salary while they are taking the courses.

Mr. DRYDEN. That is right.

Senator KEFAUVER. And will this also enable you to pay their salaries if you want to have one of your men giving special lectures?

Mr. DRYDEN. That is not the purpose.

Senator KEFAUVER. I see.

Mr. DRYDEN. This is to make them more valuable in our work.

Senator KEFAUVER. Well, I think it is a good program. Thank you.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Barrett?

Senator BARRETT. Just what are the particular and specific duties of your agency—you say, making them more valuable in your work.

Mr. DRYDEN. Well, we are, shall I say, the largest or major aeronautical research agency in the field of aerodynamics, propulsion, and aircraft construction.

Senator BARRETT. Do you work with the Air Force?

aeronautical research agency in the field of aerodynamics, propulsion, and with the civil agencies as well.

Perhaps I may give you 1 or 2 examples. Right now one of our large jobs, with the support of the military, is the bomber program, a tentative bomber to succeed the B52. We are working very closely with the Air Force. We are working in wind-tunnel investigations that bear on that particular design.

Our more specific function is the general one of advancing the technology that is used in later design, but this is one of the jobs. In connection with civil aviation, General LeMay is lending one of his KC-135 tankers, which is almost identical with the Boeing 707 jet transport. At the request of Mr. Pyle, Civil Aeronautics Administrator, and working with his people, we are flying that airplane in simulated approach to airports and so on, traffic control patterns, to help them to work out the regulations with regard to putting the new jet transports into service.

It is a very large operation. I wish you could see our laboratories sometime.

Senator BARRETT. Do you work with people like Dr. von Braun, people of that type, for instance?

Mr. DRYDEN. Dr. von Braun is a member of our Advisory Committee and we have worked with him.

For example, when the second or third Jupiter went up in flames, which curled down at the back-end of the rocket and burned down the end, he came to us and within 6 weeks we had a setup in a wind tunnel with model rockets and we burned the rockets and studied how the flame curled around the edges.

Senator BARRETT. You are available to all Government agencies?

Mr. DRYDEN. Yes.

Senator STENNIS. And private, too?

Mr. DRYDEN. Yes, there is a provision for doing work for reimbursement for purely proprietary jobs. There is very little of that

done; most of our work is at the request of the military services or Civil Aeronautics.

Senator BUSH. How much of your work is civil and how much is military?

Mr. DRYDEN. Under the present conditions, I would say 90 percent of our work is more closely related to the immediate military problems. Of course, the military problems become civilian problems 10 years from now. In the civil field, there is the item of safety of aircraft, the noise, the loads to which civilian aircraft would have to be designed, and the problems of flying through storms and the prevention of fires or the crashing of aircraft—these are the types of things which are in our area.

Senator BUSH. I would like to ask you about this noise.

Are you getting anywhere with that?

Mr. DRYDEN. It is possible to reduce noise substantially. You would not call it quiet, but it costs you something, you have to leave off 4 or 5 passengers to do it.

In other words, like any other technical area, it is a matter of compromise. You cannot get your noise reduction without paying for it and in this specific case you have to lose a little of the thrust of the engine, perhaps, and so it can be done, but at the present time it would cost some passengers in order to silence the aircraft, and this, I believe, the jet transports are prepared to do.

Chairman RUSSELL. Well, the British have gone a long ways toward solving it. Taking the Viscount, I thought that when you got into different types of propulsion that we would have the noise and vibration problems pretty well solved.

Mr. DRYDEN. The Viscount is a very fine airplane, but it is also relatively low-powered. It has four 1,000-horsepower engines and the noise goes up when your power is larger, when you plan a bigger engine, then you have more noise.

Chairman RUSSELL. Then, is it a fact that the power of the engine in the Viscount has more to do with its relative quietness than the fact it is a different type of engine?

Mr. DRYDEN. That is correct.

Chairman RUSSELL. And the noise on a Viscount, with a jet engine, would be just as great?

Mr. DRYDEN. If you put four 1,000-horsepower engines in it—the less power there is, the less noise.

Chairman RUSSELL. Well, I am glad that you came here this morning because I thought it was the type of the engine in the Viscount that was the reason it was so much quieter and had so much less vibration.

Mr. DRYDEN. No; it is primarily due to the fact that you have these four 1,000-horsepower engines and a smaller diameter propeller, that goes with smaller power.

Senator BARRETT. One more question, Dr. Dryden.

I have been somewhat impressed with the fact that we have so many unusual scientific people in the Army and Navy and Air Force, and your agency here, but it seems to me they are all working on their own and that we have no way of getting them to collaborate along with one another.

conform the Canal Zone law on this subject with that in effect in the United States and remove a considerable amount of bookkeeping costs for such small amounts of money orders outstanding.

(H. R. 3604 and H. R. 6710 follow :)

[H. R. 3604, 85th Cong., 1st sess.]

AN ACT To amend section 831 of title 5 of the Canal Zone Code to make it a felony to injure or destroy works, property, or material of communication, power, lighting, control, or signal lines, stations, or systems, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 831 of title 5 of the Canal Zone Code is hereby amended to read as follows :

"§ 831. Communication, power, lighting, control, or signal lines, stations, or systems

"Whoever (a) willfully or maliciously injures or destroys any of the works, property, or material of any radio, telegraph, telephone, cable, or television line, station, or system, or other means of communication, or of any power or lighting line, station, or system, or other means of power or lighting transmission or distribution, or of any control or signal line, station, or system, whether any such line, station, or system be constructed or in process of construction, or (b), willfully or maliciously interferes in any way with the working or use of any such line, station, or system, or (c), willfully or maliciously obstructs, hinders, or delays the transmission of any communication or signal, or the transmission or distribution of power or lighting by means of any such line, station, or system, is guilty of a felony."

Passed the House of Representatives July 1, 1957.

Attest :

RALPH R. ROBERTS, *Clerk*.

[H. R. 6710, 85th Cong., 1st sess.]

AN ACT Relating to Canal Zone money orders which remain unpaid

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That chapter 14 of title 2 of the Canal Zone Code, as amended by section 2 of the Act of June 13, 1940 (ch. 358, 54 Stat. 389), is amended by adding at the end thereof a new section numbered 282 and reading as follows :

"§ 282. Money orders unpaid after lapse of twenty years

"No money order heretofore or hereafter issued by the Canal Zone postal service shall be paid after twenty years from the last day of the month of original issue. Claims for unpaid money orders shall be forever barred unless received by the Canal Zone postal service within such twenty-year period. Funds accrued because of money orders remaining unpaid shall be treated as revenues of the Canal Zone postal service. The records of the Canal Zone postal service shall serve as the basis for adjudicating claims for payment of money orders."

SEC. 2. This Act shall take effect on the first day of the sixth calendar month beginning after the date of its enactment.

Passed the House of Representatives July 1, 1957.

Attest :

RALPH R. ROBERTS, *Clerk*.

Chairman RUSSELL. The witness on both of these bills is Mr. W. M. Whitman, Secretary of the Panama Canal Company.

STATEMENT OF W. M. WHITMAN, SECRETARY, PANAMA CANAL COMPANY

We are glad to have you here, Mr. Whitman, and you may make a brief statement with respect to these bills.

Mr. WHITMAN. These bills were each introduced at the request of the Government of Panama to fill lacks in the present provisions of the Canal Zone Code.

The first bill relates to injury or destruction of public utility systems down there and it was introduced because of the fact that at the present time the only penalty for such injury and destruction in the Canal Zone is that attached to misdemeanors or malicious mischief or petty larceny, carrying a penalty of 30 days in jail or a \$100 fine.

The United States Code provides for a felony punishment for injury or destruction of property belonging to the United States and that provision does not apply to the Panama Canal Zone proper.

Accordingly, we are recommending that the Canal Zone Code be amended to provide the same type of penalty in the Panama Canal Zone that is now applied in the United States Code for injury or destruction of property belonging to the United States Government.

That is about the substance of that first bill and if there are any questions I would be glad to answer them.

Chairman RUSSELL. Any questions, Senator Smith?

Senator STENNIS?

Senator STENNIS. What is the penalty now?

You say it is a felony?

Mr. WHITMAN. At the present time it is a misdemeanor down there and under the United States Code the felony is punishable by 5 years imprisonment or \$5,000 fine, or both.

Senator STENNIS. Or any part of both.

Mr. WHITMAN. Yes, sir.

Chairman RUSSELL. Any other questions on that bill?

(No response)

(Subsequently, in executive session, the committee voted to report the bill favorably, without amendment, covered by S. Report 1327.)

Chairman RUSSELL. The next bill, Mr. Whitman.

Mr. WHITMAN. The second bill H. R. 6710 is even more simple.

The Canal Zone Government operates its own postal system and has, since the date of the construction of the canal. It issues money orders and at the present time there is no limitation on those money orders.

Last year, in the 84th Congress, the postal law was amended to provide for a 20-year period of limitation on United States postal money orders, so that money orders remaining unpaid after that time will be taken into the Treasury and the obligation is canceled.

The Canal Zone Government is recommending a similar 20-year limitation period on Canal Zone Government money orders.

Chairman RUSSELL. Any questions?

(No response.)

Chairman RUSSELL. Thank you, Mr. Whitman.

(Subsequently, in executive session, the committee voted to report the bill favorably, without amendment, as covered by S. Rept. 1328.)

H. R. 7912

Chairman RUSSELL. The next bill is H. R. 7912, a proposal by the Department of Defense that would authorize survivors of members of the uniformed services who live in trailers to receive a trailer allowance for movement of the trailer after the member's death.

(H. R. 7912 is as follows:)

[H. R. 7912, 85th Cong., 1st sess.]

AN ACT To authorize, in case of the death of a member of the uniformed services, certain transportation expenses for his dependents

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the tenth sentence of the last proviso of section 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act, as amended (37 U. S. C. 253 (c)), is further amended—

(1) by inserting immediately after the words “who transports” the words “, or in the case of his death his dependents who transport,”; and

(2) by inserting immediately after the words “whichever he” the words “or they”.

Passed the House of Representatives July 15, 1957.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS, *Clerk*.

Chairman RUSSELL. The members of the committee may recall that in 1955 we approved legislation authorizing a trailer allowance of not to exceed 20 cents per mile. This language is so drawn that the Comptroller has ruled that the right to this payment does not survive the member although survivors of members other than those residing in trailers are entitled to transportation of their baggage and household effects after the member's death.

The witness from the Department on this bill is Col. Fred W. Vetter, Jr., Office of Director of Personnel Planning, Department of the Air Force.

STATEMENT OF COL. FRED W. VETTER, JR., DIRECTORATE OF PERSONNEL PLANNING, OFFICE, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF, PERSONNEL, HEADQUARTERS, USAF

Chairman RUSSELL. Colonel Vetter, the purpose of this bill, as I understand, is to allow the small number of survivors of those who live in trailers to enjoy a benefit comparable with those who do not live in trailers.

Colonel VETTER. That is right.

Chairman RUSSELL. And it is a very small number of people that are involved?

Colonel VETTER. Very small.

Chairman RUSSELL. Do you have any estimate of the annual cost?

Colonel VETTER. The annual cost should not exceed \$10,000 a year.

Chairman RUSSELL. \$10,000 a year?

Colonel VETTER. And that is for the entire Department of Defense.

Chairman RUSSELL. That is for the entire Department?

Colonel VETTER. Yes; and it would be absorbed by the Department of Defense by the various services.

Chairman RUSSELL. And that is designed to equalize the benefit to those who could not take advantage of the act that we passed?

Colonel VETTER. That is right, the problem being that the household goods of people who live in trailers are an integral part, very often, of the trailers themselves, and it is impossible for them to take advantage of shipping their household goods, they must leave them with the trailer.

This would provide an allowance for the movement of the trailer which would include household goods.

Chairman RUSSELL. I think that the evidence would tend to indicate that perhaps the Government got by a little cheaper in transportation by trailer than in other cases.

Colonel VETTER. Right now, Senator, the approximate cost of movement for enlisted personnel of household goods is about \$167 and \$222 for officers. Travel allowance, if the individual hauls his trailer, amounts to 11 cents per mile, and if he has a call, he is allowed up to 20 cents a mile, and under the present law it is true that frequently you get off cheaper.

Chairman RUSSELL. Any questions, Senator Smith?

Senator SMITH. No questions.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Stennis?

Senator STENNIS. No questions.

Chairman RUSSELL. Senator Bush?

Senator BUSH. No questions.

Chairman RUSSELL. Thank you very much.

(The prepared statement of Col. Fred W. Vetter, Jr., on H. R. 7912 follows:)

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I am Col. Fred W. Vetter, Jr., Directorate of Personnel Planning, Office, Deputy Chief of Staff, Personnel, Department of the Air Force.

The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. I represent the Air Force for that purpose.

This bill will amend section 303 (c) of the Career Compensation Act, as amended (37 U. S. C. 253 (c)) to authorize, under regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the service concerned, the payment of a trailer allowance in lieu of transportation of baggage and household goods for departments of members who die on active duty.

The Career Incentive Act of 1955 (69 Stat. 18) authorized payment of a trailer allowance for members of the uniformed services who move a trailer within the continental United States for use as a residence. This allowance is payable only to members entitled to transportation of baggage and household goods and is in lieu of such transportation, at the election of the member. The Comptroller General rule (B-126607, April 25, 1956) that trailer allowance could not be paid as an alternate to shipment of baggage and household goods after the death of a member. This ruling has resulted in inequitable treatment for survivors of members whose trailers constitute their entire household. The ruling has the practical effect of denying any transportation benefits to these dependents, for the purpose of relocating their household, and creates inequitable treatment and hardship.

The current average payment made for movement of a trailer on permanent change of station is approximately \$167. The average cost of transportation of household goods upon separation from service is approximately \$222 for officers and approximately \$147 for enlisted men. Notwithstanding the fact that the trailer allowance is paid in lieu of the transportation of household goods, this proposal may result in small increased costs, since as a practical matter, dependents of deceased members who now reside in trailers currently receive little, if any, transportation entitlements for movement of household effects. Costs of the proposal would, however, be nominal. They are not expected to exceed \$10,000 per annum for the entire Department of Defense and can be absorbed from existing appropriations. The Department of Defense strongly recommends that the proposal be given favorable consideration.

This concludes my prepared statement. I shall be pleased to answer any question you may have with regard to this matter.

(Subsequently, in executive session, the committee voted to report the bill, without amendment, as covered by S. Rept. 1330.)

H. R. 5237

Chairman RUSSELL. The last bill for the open hearing is H. R. 5237, another Department of Defense proposal.
(H. R. 5237 is as follows:)

[H. R. 5237, 85th Cong., 1st sess.]

AN ACT To authorize the Secretary of the Navy to furnish supplies and services to foreign vessels and aircraft, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That section 7227 of title 10, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“§ 7227. Foreign naval vessels and aircraft: supplies and services

“(a) The Secretary of the Navy, under such regulations as he prescribes, may authorize any United States naval vessel or activity to furnish, on a reimbursable basis without advance of funds, to naval vessels and military aircraft of any foreign country which makes available comparable assistance—

“(1) supplies and services such as overhauling, repairs, and alterations, including the installation of equipment; and

“(2) miscellaneous supplies such as fuel, provisions, spare parts, and general stores.

“(b) The Secretary may authorize any United States naval activity to furnish on a reciprocal basis to foreign vessels or aircraft, without cost where such services are provided by Navy personnel or equipment without direct cost to the Navy, or on a reimbursable basis without advance of funds where direct costs to the Navy are involved—

“(1) routine port services such as pilotage, tugs, garbage removal, line handling, and utilities; and

“(2) routine airport services such as landing and takeoff assistance, use of runways, parking, and servicing.

“(c) Payments for supplies and services furnished under this section may be credited to current appropriations so as to be available for the same purpose as the appropriation initially charged.”

SEC. 2. The analysis of chapter 631 of title 10, United States Code, is amended by striking out the item

“7227. Foreign naval vessels: supplies and services.”

and inserting the following item in place thereof:

“7227. Foreign naval vessels and aircraft: supplies and services”.

Passed the House of Representatives May 20, 1957.

Attest:

RALPH R. ROBERTS, *Clerk*.

Chairman RUSSELL. This bill apparently seeks to broaden the existing authority under which the Secretary of the Navy may furnish routine port services and miscellaneous supplies to foreign naval vessels. Unless there is immediate payment, these port services and supplies may now be furnished only to foreign naval vessels at ports and naval bases of the United States.

The bill apparently would authorize the furnishing of supplies and services without an advance of funds at places other than ports and naval bases of the United States.

It also would authorize the furnishing of supplies and services to foreign aircraft, and it would permit overhauling and repairs without an immediate advance of funds.

The witness from the Department on this bill is Capt. Thomas C. Roberts from the Supply Policy Section, Office of Chief of Naval Operations.

STATEMENT OF CAPT. THOMAS C. ROBERTS, USN, SUPPLY POLICY
SECTION, OFFICE OF CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS

Captain ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, I have a statement if you would like me to read it.

Chairman RUSSELL. Very well.

Captain ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, and members of the committee:

The act of May 27, 1953, commonly referred to as Public Law 33 (83d Cong.), was sponsored by the Department of the Navy for the purpose of expediting the furnishing of supplies and services to foreign naval vessels in United States ports.

That legislation provides that services and supplies can be furnished on a reimbursable basis to naval vessels of those friendly foreign nations with whom reciprocal agreements have been negotiated. Reciprocal agreements pursuant to this authority have been consummated with Canada, Peru, Ecuador, and Cuba.

Subsequent to the preparation of this paper, Australia and Pakistan have been added.

Negotiations are still underway with a number of other foreign countries. It is now apparent that the provisions of this act are not sufficiently broad and flexible to permit adequate support of our world-wide operations with friendly foreign military forces. The following important considerations have led us to this conclusion.

Senator BUSH. If I may interrupt, when you say "reciprocal agreements," is that reciprocal trade agreements or are they outside of that act?

Captain ROBERTS. It is outside of that.

First, the original act applies to furnishing supplies and services to foreign naval vessels in United States ports only. There is no other legislation to authorize the sale of material and services to foreign naval units other than this act. It has been concluded that our world-wide operations, many of which require continued close support of friendly foreign naval units, necessitate extending this authority, to enable the United States Navy to provide logistic support at locations other than in a United States port.

The limitation imposed by the act necessitated disapproval of a COMSIXTHFLT request to approve the issue of supplies to Allied Forces incident to joint exercises, for items which could be spared, and for which the allied naval officials concerned agreed their governments would promptly reimburse the United States. Thus, the act precluded our providing minor repairs and services to NATO foreign naval units which frequently operate with United States naval task forces.

A second consideration is the restriction that supplies and services can only be furnished when a prior agreement conferring reciprocal rights on the United States has been negotiated with the country concerned. Negotiations with NATO countries of agreements pursuant to Public Law 33, and importantly with Great Britain, revealed the inadvisability of having separate formal reciprocal agreements. British authorities maintain that a formal agreement is not necessary, since supplies and services have been done heretofore on a basis of long-standing custom and honored verbal agreement.

NATO, through its Military Agency for Standardization, has generated a single agreement for all NATO nations providing for the

furnishing of port services and supplies on a reimbursable basis without an advance of funds.

There are a number of advantages to having a single agreement under NATO. However, due to the conflict of the NATO agreement with Public Law 33, it has not been possible for the United States to approve the NATO agreement. Enactment of the proposed amendment, which still requires that a foreign government furnish comparable assistance, will give the required authority for the United States to approve the NATO standardization agreement.

A third consideration is the restriction that supplies and services such as overhauling, repairs, and alterations be accomplished only after receipt of an advance of funds.

This presents no problem under normal peacetime conditions, when a repair is accomplished at a United States facility. Our concern is to have authority to enable us to render this type of service to a friendly foreign naval ship anywhere in the world and under emergency conditions when it is to our advantage to furnish the service.

The requirement of an advance of funds under emergency conditions would delay, and in some cases obviate, the advantage of providing the services.

In addition, we have experienced difficulty in negotiating agreements which include this restriction. Great Britain is our best illustration. Frequent repairs are made to United States naval vessels in British yards and no advance of funds to the Royal Navy is required. Infrequent repairs of British naval ships are accomplished by United States naval facilities. As previously mentioned, British authorities are reluctant to enter into an agreement formalizing this restriction which is in opposition to established long-standing naval custom and honored oral agreement.

This has placed the United States in an embarrassing position, since, by law, we are required to receive payment in advance for services which are performed by other governments without the requirement of making an advance of funds.

Last is the matter of including foreign military aircraft within the scope of the act. Current and future naval operations, many of which are performed in conjunction with foreign forces, include the use of aircraft. It is therefore important that the Navy have authority to furnish supplies and services to military aircraft for the same reasons as apply to naval ships.

This amendment to Public Law 33, as proposed, is not intended to place the Navy in the position of being the major source of supplies and services for support of foreign naval units. It does not place an obligation upon the United States. It is permissive only, in that it would authorize the furnishing of supplies and services only when they are readily available, and as the situation warrants.

Accordingly, the Department of the Navy recommends extension of its authority to permit providing support to friendly foreign naval ships and aircraft on a reimbursable basis as required to support national policy under peacetime and emergency conditions.

Chairman RUSSELL. I am not sure I understand this bill, Captain. We passed a law here sometime ago that let us enter into agreements with foreign countries to supply those foreign ships; did we not?

Captain ROBERTS. That was Public Law 33, 83d Congress.

Chairman RUSSELL. Why cannot that be made applicable to all cases?

Captain ROBERTS. Because it is restricted. In other words, it is restricted to United States ports and it is on a reimbursable basis only with the nation, the friendly foreign nation that had signed a reciprocal agreement with the United States.

It has been very difficult to accomplish those agreements.

Chairman RUSSELL. Well, I thought that we could furnish any country in a United States port under existing law.

Captain ROBERTS. I have no personal knowledge, sir, of furnishing any country. We do it on an emergency basis many times to enable a ship to go back to its home port. In other words we can repair a ship and we are providing particular supplies in emergencies to enable the ship to reach its home port. I think that is as far as it goes.

Chairman RUSSELL. Will you give me an illustration of just how this bill would work? Let us have an emergency one.

Captain ROBERTS. Well, when the 6th United States Fleet is operating in the Mediterranean, we have joint exercises with foreign naval vessels. For instance, there would be an amphibious exercise where you have landing craft and landing ships of foreign nations or we may have a convoy exercise to work out convoy techniques.

If they are very short exercises, then it is not too difficult, but if the exercises entail some days then the task force commander is hampered inasmuch as he is not permitted by the law to support the foreign vessels.

And then also there are the ships coming into United States ports that requires services or supplies or repairs. Those foreign warships, if they are not the ships of a nation that is a signatory to this agreement, they will have to provide in advance the funds for that. In peacetime that is not too bad, but in wartime it means that the commandant of the yard gets an estimate and he submits to the foreign country embassy. Foreign warships carry no money or very little money and it takes some time before the authority for the money and the money is available to do that work in advance of the work.

Chairman RUSSELL. We have to do that now in United States ports?

Captain ROBERTS. We do, sir, on exercises. We have exercises in the Atlantic and ships of foreign nations, say, South American, sometimes find it necessary to make repairs to those ships before they can participate in the exercises——

Senator BUSH. What authority would you have to proceed?

Captain ROBERTS. To be able to do this on a reimbursable basis, in other words, without the requirement of advance payment——

Senator BUSH. I mean, what authority do the owners or operators of the ships have to give you, do you get a cable from his government?

Captain ROBERTS. No, Senator. It is a request for repairs and then he would have to get the money in advance before the repairs were done, but he can authorize the repairs, the commanding officer of the naval vessel.

Senator SALTONSTALL. May I ask a question, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman RUSSELL. Certainly.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Would this mean, Captain, that if an airplane of another country landed on the deck of one of our carriers,

could he get repairs, if he had to land and wanted to get repairs under the present law, or would that pilot have to furnish the cash?

Captain ROBERTS. Well, that would be an emergency and he would be taken care of and those repairs would be made.

Senator SALTONSTALL. All right, suppose it was not an emergency landing. Do I understand correctly under the present law he would have to pay cash in advance?

Captain ROBERTS. Technically, sir, he would if it is not an emergency.

Senator SALTONSTALL. And what you are trying to do now is to make it possible for us to go ahead and repair and then say, "Here is the bill, now you pay?"

Captain ROBERTS. That is right, sir.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Thank you.

Chairman RUSSELL. I am perhaps a little obtuse on this, but under the existing law if a foreign naval vessel of a friendly power puts in to Norfolk to refuel, would he have to pay cash on the barrel?

Captain ROBERTS. Yes, sir; if not a signatory.

Chairman RUSSELL. And he would have to pay the cash before we could refuel him?

Captain ROBERTS. Yes, sir.

Chairman RUSSELL. This is a pretty broad bill in some respects. I think I am in favor of what you are trying to do.

I notice in the report that it says that this bill would authorize furnishing "supplies and services to foreign naval vessels and military aircraft."

That could be construed to mean bombs of most any kind.

Captain ROBERTS. I do not believe that ammunition would be considered, although it is possible, but it is meant to supply services and repairs to aircraft of foreign nations, naval aircraft that operate with our task forces and we have repaired ships, where there are air tenders and supply boats which supply aeronautical material and this would enable us to assist those planes.

Chairman RUSSELL. Well, if these ships of the other nations that were going through maneuvers or exercises with our people, if they were to run low on food for the crew, we could furnish them food under this law?

Captain ROBERTS. Yes, sir; and as it is now there is no provision for so doing it.

Chairman RUSSELL. You could not do it even if in United States ports under existing law?

Captain ROBERTS. No, sir; not under existing law we could not.

Chairman RUSSELL. And, so, apparently there was no great rush under the act of 1953 to sign those agreements?

Captain ROBERTS. I think the primary purpose of the act of 1953 was to enable us to have authority to make repairs to these ships in port but it did not take care of overseas activities which are on a worldwide basis with joint operations of the warships of more than one nation operating together.

Chairman RUSSELL. Are these reimbursements by funds appropriated by the Congress for military support, or are the funds that are cleared through the recipient nation coming back to us in their currency, or how?

Captain ROBERTS. The services are made and they are billed and they come into the United States, and they get into the Accounting Office and the embassy of the foreign nation is billed for that service, and I might say that we have a very remarkable record on the ships of the nations who have entered into the agreement with us.

The last figure I have was about \$1,244,000 up through fiscal year 1957, and of that \$1,244,000 my check shows that there was less than \$10,000 outstanding, and none of that was for arrears.

Senator BUSH. 100 percent?

Captain ROBERTS. It was practically 100 percent, and those that do hold out, it is, we will say, for 4 or 6 months.

It is a matter of the nation receiving the service getting substantiation from the commander of that vessel.

Chairman RUSSELL. You have discussed this, Captain, on the theory, and of course that appeals to all of us, of joint maneuvers and operations, but there is nothing in the bill that limits it to that; this could supply them if they ever operated with American ships under this bill.

Captain ROBERTS. It could, sir, but that is at the discretion of the area or task force commander, and only insofar as it would assist the United States in doing its job.

Chairman RUSSELL. Can you give any estimate of the amount of money that is likely to be involved in this?

Captain ROBERTS. Well, we have tried to estimate it. I think that the amount expended would be a little more in that period because of the fact that we do have an increasing number of exercises overseas as NATO and our joint naval facilities get more useful to each other, and they operate in larger areas and in greater numbers of units. There is a possibility that it will.

Chairman RUSSELL. I do not like to appear suspicious, but I am getting pretty leery of all legislation of this type. I realize that the appropriations made for this purpose will be reimbursed by these funds.

Captain ROBERTS. Yes, sir.

Chairman RUSSELL. But that brings the question of where the funds are going to come from that is going to reimburse it. We have got all kinds of aid programs going on where we are spending an awful lot of money and then we are reimbursed by the appropriations to that fund, but in the last analysis the supplies and services are gone and you are taking out of one pocket and putting it into another.

This is pretty broad language:

Supplies and services, overhauling, repairs, and alterations, including the installation of equipment.

Captain ROBERTS. That is right.

Chairman RUSSELL. You can remake a ship, practically, with that language. You could modernize it, could you not?

Captain ROBERTS. Of course it may be interpreted that way, sir, but I think it is permissive only on the part of the United States and it is done for the United States only as an assistance to the United States in accomplishing its purpose. There is no desire to hand out our supplies; we only do it as necessary to facilitate operations.

Chairman RUSSELL. I realize that is the way you have operated up until now, Captain.

This includes also—

miscellaneous supplies such as fuel, provisions, spare parts, and general stores.

That would cover most anything except ammunition that went aboard the ship, would it not?

Captain ROBERTS. Yes, sir. That would cover supplies that contributed to the operation.

Chairman RUSSELL. And on a reimbursable basis—

routine port services such as pilotage, tugs, garbage removal, line handling, and utilities; and (2) routine airport services such as landing and takeoff assistance, use of runways, parking, and servicing.

Under those conditions, if I understand them, we could defray the cost incurred by other countries in foreign ports for port services, pilotage, tugs, garbage removal, and so forth.

Captain ROBERTS. Incurred by United States vessels at foreign ports?

Chairman RUSSELL. We do that now, you are talking about for other countries. This authorizes us to furnish all of this to foreign countries. I want to know if that includes in foreign ports.

Captain ROBERTS. No, sir; that is on a reciprocal basis, that we would furnish it in the United States port and they would furnish it overseas, and I think that NATO has done that, there is a NATO agreement and those will be on the reciprocal basis.

Chairman RUSSELL. This is not limited to NATO powers, Captain.

Captain ROBERTS. No, sir.

Chairman RUSSELL. It could be any foreign country and under the literal interpretation you could deal with the Soviet navy on this.

Captain ROBERTS. Well, it is limited to friendly foreign nations.

Chairman RUSSELL. Where do you find that word "friendly"? I do not find it.

Captain ROBERTS. It says, aircraft of any foreign country which makes available comparable assistance.

Chairman RUSSELL. Well, as I say, we could enter into an agreement with the Russians just as quickly, if they made it available to us.

Captain ROBERTS. But I feel that it is still permissive upon the United States. In other words, at the discretion of the commander.

Chairman RUSSELL. I know, but we are legislating here.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Would you yield?

Chairman RUSSELL. Yes.

Senator SALTONSTALL. There is some language here, Captain, that I call to the chairman's attention which is unusual language and it is this at the top of page 2:

* * * any foreign country which makes available comparable assistance—

(1) Supplies and services such as overhauling, repairs, and alterations, including the installation of equipment; and (2) miscellaneous supplies.

Now, you use the words "supplies and services such as overhauling, repairs, and alterations."

That, of course, is very broad terms, and that is shown only as an example.

Why could you not strike out the words "supplies and services," because there would not be any question of ammunition, and say "comparable assistance—(1) overhauling, repairs, and alterations, including the installation of equipment"?

Then you would not have them as examples. That is a very unusual form of legislation.

Captain ROBERTS. That is acceptable.

Senator CASE. What is stricken out?

Chairman ROBERTS. We have not taken any action on that and we will not until the executive session, but Senator Saltonstall has made a suggestion.

Senator CASE. I would like to ask some questions.

Chairman RUSSELL. All right.

Senator CASE. Under this legislation in the form in which it now is, would the planes which had been supplied to France and which were used in the bombing of Tunisia, would they be able to come to a naval station or ship and ask for replenishment of their bomb supplies?

Captain ROBERTS. No, sir; that is not the purpose.

Senator CASE. That is not the purpose, but under the act it could be done under this legislation?

Captain ROBERTS. I think that bombs are not included, sir. "Supplies," in that terminology—aircraft equipment.

Senator CASE. Could the aircraft itself be repaired if it was one of the aircraft used in that bombing in North Africa, say that were injured in some way, could they come to the naval ships.

Captain ROBERTS. Any services and supplies from a naval ship; yes, sir—that would be aircraft of a friendly foreign nation.

Senator CASE. I recall Admiral Radford coming and advising that a couple of dozen American airmen were being loaned to France to repair aircraft being used in the struggle that they had 2 years ago on a temporary basis and we were fearful because those mechanics and airmen were placed with the French to service the aircraft which they were using that they might be bombed by hostile aircraft and some of us were wondering if the American airmen on loan were injured in retaliatory bombing if that would not involve the United States in a struggle where we had no declaration of war.

Chairman RUSSELL. I recall that incident. We wound up with several hundred airmen that stayed there much longer than we thought they would.

Senator CASE. But we did serve notice on the French, I think, we would only go so far and I think that if we are in the business of loaning military aircraft or turning over military aircraft to other countries and then have incidents of this type, that it is a direct invitation for them to be repaired and to be supplied by our stations and our bases and our ships and gives us less and less control over incidents which could involve the United States in maintaining colonial outposts of some other countries.

Senator STENNIS. Would you yield?

Senator CASE. Yes.

Senator STENNIS. If we are going to have these foreign aid programs as between the naval forces, is not something along this line almost necessary?

Senator CASE. If you could put in some phrase to make sure that the supplies were being used not when the other country was engaged in military activities, I would then agree, but I do not think we should be put in a position to giving supplies to the other countries when they are in the midst of a military operation.

Senator BUSH. Let me ask the captain if he would comment on that. I am impressed with the observation of Senator Case.

Captain ROBERTS. Senator, the purpose of this bill is to facilitate the commitments of our own naval ships overseas and in ports to operate jointly, for one, and to make it easier for the foreign warships in the United States.

It is not intended as a free-for-all, or an open door for periodic supplies, or supplies to maintain their warships; it is to assist in the joint operations and in our commitments with our friendly foreign naval vessels.

Senator BUSH. On a reimbursable basis?

Captain ROBERTS. Yes. We do it now under the present bill; we are merely asking that it be put on a reimbursable basis so we could facilitate our operations.

Senator CASE. I think that one of the most effective bits of propaganda which was injected in the United States today is the statement that we are furnishing the aircraft which were used in the bombing of Tunisia, and this would permit those aircraft to be serviced or ships to be repaired or craft in other military operations, independent military operations in which we had no voice in starting and were not directly involved.

Captain ROBERTS. I can only say, sir, aircraft of a friendly foreign nation that requires service in their operations with the United States is intended.

Senator BUSH. We have got a naval base down at Rota?

Captain ROBERTS. Sir.

Senator BUSH. The Senator has got a very interesting point. The French aircraft would be able to fly in there and be repaired?

Captain ROBERTS. I do not think that we would offer service, inasmuch as this bill is permissive on the part of the naval commander or the area commander.

Senator STENNIS. You think we could be satisfied that there was no such mission in mind, or problem, before he got it?

Captain ROBERTS. Yes, yes.

Senator STENNIS. You say you are doing this now except not on the reimbursable basis?

Captain ROBERTS. It is being done only on advance of cash.

Senator STENNIS. Is that accepted in naval parlance as being the proper thing to do with friendly nations, "I will help you along the road" proposition?

Captain ROBERTS. To help us, primarily.

Senator STENNIS. I know, but it is on a reciprocal basis, reciprocity is involved.

Captain ROBERTS. Very much so. Great Britain has objected. They state that we have used their coaling station at Hong Kong and various places around the world, and they have got the use of our Honolulu base, from time immemorial.

Senator STENNIS. You mean they object to the present law?

Captain ROBERTS. No; they object to signing the agreement. Our purpose is to put it on a reimbursable basis to facilitate the operations and procedure and make it more flexible for our area commander.

Chairman RUSSELL. Do you think it would be harmful for the purposes of this bill if we were to put in some dollar limitation in here

on the amount involved, Captain? This is a broad grant of authority here.

Captain ROBERTS. I am not prepared to say at this time about putting a dollar limitation on it. The ship might need a major overhaul job to get him back home or to get him ready for an exercise, you might say.

Chairman RUSSELL. I though you said that it has only been \$1,200,000 last year: did you not?

Captain ROBERTS. Yes, sir, over the fiscal year, that is that part of fiscal 1956 and fiscal 1957.

Chairman RUSSELL. I was of the opinion that we never would have had any great difficulty if the ship was really in trouble, for example, if two ships rammed each other, I did not think that we waited for a whole lot of formality; I though that we tried to get it into a dock and fixed it up—and we have been doing that for a hundred years; haven't we?

Captain ROBERTS. Yes, sir; but when we are in a port and there is no emergency, then the procedure is to go through the channels of those nations and after the amount of the estimate of cost is reported.

Senator BUSH. I cannot see why it should take very long with the communication facilities we have.

Captain ROBERTS. The vessel must have the cash. Now, we have had cases where we have had exercises and we have had a ship in our port which did not go into the exercise and it was necessary to delay the exercise because of the time to get the money from his country.

Senator BUSH. But is that not a question of being embarrassed?

Captain ROBERTS. That is correct.

Senator BUSH. It is a question of social embarrassment more than anything else.

Captain ROBERTS. That is a part.

Senator BUSH. Pretty large part, it seem to me; is that not it?

Captain ROBERTS. Well, there are two parts. We have had embarrassment with Great Britain on that.

Senator BUSH. I frankly do not object to the bill itself, but I do not think that it is too important a matter.

Senator CASE. Mr. Chairman, the existing law provides that this can be done on a reimbursable basis without advance of funds if there was a prior agreement confirming reciprocal rights to the United States.

Captain ROBERTS. Yes, sir; but we have tried to negotiate reciprocal agreements with friendly nations.

Senator CASE. With England?

Captain ROBERTS. Yes, sir.

Senator CASE. With Canada?

Captain ROBERTS. Yes, sir.

Senator CASE. And you cannot with England?

Captain ROBERTS. No, sir; England has not.

Senator BUSH. They will not negotiate?

Captain ROBERTS. England has negotiated, but will not sign an agreement.

Senator SALTONSTALL (presiding). In the absence of the chairman may I ask another question?

Suppose you put on page 2 under subparagraph (b) this limitation: "The Secretary may authorize any United State naval activity," and then insert "in territorial waters of the United States or waters

under its control to furnish on a reciprocal basis"—that would eliminate any question at all of our doing it without cost, things such as pilotage, garbage removal, and so forth, in any port outside the United States?

That, I think, is the purpose, as you have explained it. That would tie this bill down a bit. If you agree that might be helpful.

Then the question is whether we ought to put that same language in under (a). I am not sure that it should go under (a) because you have got those ships in the Mediterranean and you might want to do it on a reimbursable basis over there.

Captain ROBERTS. At this time I see no reason why it should not be done under (b). I do not think it would be appropriate under (a) inasmuch as we are operating in those waters with friendly naval vessels, and that is where we need the services.

Senator SALTONSTALL. Mr. Chairman, I was asking:

Captain, would it be perfectly agreeable to you on page 2, subparagraph (1), at line 3, supposing we said, "supplies and services of repairs and alterations" instead of "supplies and services such as"?

That would be clear as to what the supplies and services were to do, it would seem to me that was essential.

Senator CASE. Supposing you use the language of the present law. Mr. Chairman, the present law gives them the authority to furnish foreign naval vessels in ports of the United States (1) routine port services, including pilotage, tugs, garbage removal, line handling, and utilities, on a reimbursable basis," and so forth.

I do not think that it is quite true that this is merely proposing to do what is now done, when you come to the words "routine port services, including pilotage, tugs, garbage removal, line handling, and utilities," strike that out and use the language "supplies and services such as overhauling, repairs, and alterations, including the installation of equipment"—"overhauling, repairs, and alterations, including the installation of equipment" is a much broader thing than providing routine port facilities including pilotage, tugs, garbage removal, and so forth.

Chairman RUSSELL. I think that we will want to look this bill over a little bit before we take any action on it. Are there any further questions of Captain Roberts at this time?

(No response.)

Chairman RUSSELL. If not, we will close the open hearings.

(The committee agreed to consider the bill (H. R. 5237) at a later date.)

(Whereupon, at 12:10 p. m., the open hearing was concluded.)

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

S. 3262

Public Law 85-365

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Index and Summary of S. 3262.....	1
Digest of Public Law 85-365.....	2

DIGEST OF PUBLIC LAW 85-365

OLYMPIC GAMES IN TAHOE NATIONAL FOREST. Authorizes the Secretary of a military department to assist in staging the VIII Olympic Winter Games in 1960 in Squaw Valley, California, by providing military personnel and equipment. Out of moneys appropriated by Congress, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to provide funds to the Organizing Committee for the games to construct a sports arena on Federal land in the Tahoe National Forest. As completed the arena becomes property of the U. S.

Approved for release by NSA on 07-25-2014 pursuant to E.O. 13526

Index and Summary of S. 3262

Feb. 10, 1958	Senator Knowland, for himself and others, introduced S. 3262. Print of bill.
Feb. 13, 1958	Rep. Allen introduced H. R. 10662. Print of bill.
Feb. 13, 1958	Rep. Hillings introduced H. R. 10687. Print of bill.
Feb. 13, 1958	Rep. Miller introduced H. R. 10695. Print of bill.
Feb. 13, 1958	Rep. Shelley introduced H. R. 10713. Print of bill.
Feb. 13, 1958	Rep. McDonough introduced H. R. 10729. Print of bill.
Feb. 17, 1958	Rep. Engle introduced H. R. 10753. Print of bill.
Feb. 27, 1958	Senate committee ordered S. 3262 reported with amendments.
Mar. 4, 1958	Senate committee reported S. 3262 with amendments. S. Rept. 1342. Print of bill and report.
Mar. 6, 1958	Senate passed S. 3262 as reported.
Mar. 10, 1958	S. 3262 was referred to the House Armed Services Committee. Print of bill as referred.
Mar. 11, 1958	House committee ordered S. 3262 reported.
Mar. 13, 1958	House committee reported S. 3262 without amendment. H. Rept. 1499. Print of bill and report.
Mar. 18, 1958	Rep. Miller requested consideration of S. 3262. The Speaker stated he would recognize Rep. Miller Wed., Mar. 19 to move to suspend rules to consider bill.
Mar. 19, 1958	House rejected motion to suspend rules to consider S. 3262.

Index and Summary of S. 3262 cont'd

March 28, 1958 House passed S. 3262 without amendment.

April 3, 1958 Approved: Public Law 85-363.

Hearings: Before Senate Committee on
Armed Forces; Feb. 27, 1958.

85TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 3262

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 10, 1958

Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MALONE, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. KENNEDY) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services

A BILL

To authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 That, (a) notwithstanding any other provision of law, the
4 Secretary of a military department may, with respect to
5 the VIII Olympic Winter Games—

6 (1) permit personnel of the Armed Forces under
7 his jurisdiction to prepare courses, fields, and rinks,
8 maintain avalanche control, and provide communica-
9 tions;

10 (2) lend necessary equipment; and

1 (3) provide such other support as he considers
2 appropriate.

3 (b) The Secretary of the military department con-
4 cerned may spend such funds for the purposes of this section
5 as Congress may specifically appropriate for those purposes.
6 He may acquire and utilize such supplies, material, and
7 equipment as he determines to be necessary to provide the
8 support authorized by this section.

9 (c) The authority provided to the Secretaries of the
10 military departments by this section is permissive and not
11 mandatory.

12 SEC. 2. Out of moneys appropriated by Congress for the
13 specific purpose, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to the
14 Organizing Committee, VIII Olympic Winter Games, Squaw
15 Valley, California, U. S. A. 1960, Incorporated, a nonprofit
16 corporation of the State of California, at its request, funds
17 sufficient to construct, on land of the United States in Squaw
18 Valley, Placer County, California, a sports arena suitable for
19 the conduct of sports and appropriate ceremonies in connec-
20 tion with the VIII Olympic Winter Games. The expendi-
21 ture of such funds by the Committee is subject to such audit
22 as the Comptroller General of the United States may pre-
23 scribe.

:noil

Enclosure (1)

A BILL

To authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

By Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MALONE,
Mr. CARLSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr.
BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. KENNEDY

FEBRUARY 10, 1958

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Armed Services

85TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 10654

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 10, 1958

Mr. WILSON of California introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

A BILL

To authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 That (a) notwithstanding any other provision of law, the
4 Secretary of a military department may, with respect to
5 the VIII Olympic Winter Games—

6 (1) permit personnel of the Armed Forces under
7 this jurisdiction to prepare courses, fields, and rinks,
8 maintain avalanche control, and provide communications;

9 (2) lend necessary equipment; and

10 (3) provide such other support as he considers
11 appropriate.

1 (b) The Secretary of the military department con-
2 cerned may spend such funds for the purposes of this section
3 as Congress may specifically appropriate for those purposes.
4 He may acquire and utilize such supplies, materiel, and
5 equipment as he determines to be necessary to provide the
6 support authorized by this section.

7 (c) The authority provided to the Secretaries of the
8 military departments by this section is permissive and not
9 mandatory.

10 SEC. 2. Out of moneys appropriated by Congress for the
11 specific purpose, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to
12 the Organizing Committee, VIII Olympic Winter Games,
13 Squaw Valley, California, U. S. A. 1960, Incorporated, a
14 nonprofit corporation of the State of California, at its request,
15 funds sufficient to construct, on land of the United States in
16 Squaw Valley, Placer County, California, a sports arena
17 suitable for the conduct of sports and appropriate ceremonies
18 in connection with the VIII Olympic Winter Games. The
19 expenditure of such funds by the Committee is subject to
20 such audit as the Comptroller General of the United States
21 may prescribe.

85TH CONGRESS
2d Session

H. R. 10654

A BILL

To authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

By Mr. Wilson of California

FEBRUARY 10, 1958

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

85TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 10662

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 13, 1958

Mr. ALLEN of California introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

A BILL

To authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 That (a) notwithstanding any other provision of law, the
4 Secretary of a military department may, with respect to
5 the VIII Olympic Winter Games—

6 (1) permit personnel of the Armed Forces under
7 this jurisdiction to prepare courses, fields, and rinks,
8 maintain avalanche control, and provide communications;

9 (2) lend necessary equipment; and

10 (3) provide such other support as he considers
11 appropriate.

1 (b) The Secretary of the military department con-
2 cerned may spend such funds for the purposes of this section
3 as Congress may specifically appropriate for those purposes.
4 He may acquire and utilize such supplies, materiel, and
5 equipment as he determines to be necessary to provide the
6 support authorized by this section.

7 (c) The authority provided to the Secretaries of the
8 military departments by this section is permissive and not
9 mandatory.

10 SEC. 2. Out of moneys appropriated by Congress for the
11 specific purpose, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to
12 the Organizing Committee, VIII Olympic Winter Games,
13 Squaw Valley, California, U. S. A. 1960, Incorporated, a
14 nonprofit corporation of the State of California, at its request,
15 funds sufficient to construct, on land of the United States in
16 Squaw Valley, Placer County, California, a sports arena
17 suitable for the conduct of sports and appropriate ceremonies
18 in connection with the VIII Olympic Winter Games. The
19 expenditure of such funds by the Committee is subject to
20 such audit as the Comptroller General of the United States
21 may prescribe.

A BILL

To authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ALLEN of California

FEBRUARY 13, 1958

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

85TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 10687

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 13, 1958

Mr. HILLINGS introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

A BILL

To authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 That (a) notwithstanding any other provision of law, the
4 Secretary of a military department may, with respect to
5 the VIII Olympic Winter Games—

6 (1) permit personnel of the Armed Forces under
7 this jurisdiction to prepare courses, fields, and rinks,
8 maintain avalanche control, and provide communications;

9 (2) lend necessary equipment; and

10 (3) provide such other support as he considers
11 appropriate.

1 (b) The Secretary of the military department con-
2 cerned may spend such funds for the purposes of this section
3 as Congress may specifically appropriate for those purposes.
4 He may acquire and utilize such supplies, materiel, and
5 equipment as he determines to be necessary to provide the
6 support authorized by this section.

7 (c) The authority provided to the Secretaries of the
8 military departments by this section is permissive and not
9 mandatory.

10 SEC. 2. Out of moneys appropriated by Congress for the
11 specific purpose, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to
12 the Organizing Committee, VIII Olympic Winter Games,
13 Squaw Valley, California, U. S. A. 1960, Incorporated, a
14 nonprofit corporation of the State of California, at its request,
15 funds sufficient to construct, on land of the United States in
16 Squaw Valley, Placer County, California, a sports arena
17 suitable for the conduct of sports and appropriate ceremonies
18 in connection with the VIII Olympic Winter Games. The
19 expenditure of such funds by the Committee is subject to
20 such audit as the Comptroller General of the United States
21 may prescribe.

A BILL

To authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

By Mr. HULLINGS

FEBRUARY 13, 1958

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

85TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 10695

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 13, 1958

Mr. MILLER of California introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

A BILL

To authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 That (a), notwithstanding any other provision of law, the
4 Secretary of a military department may, with respect to the
5 VIII Olympic Winter Games—

6 (1) permit personnel of the Armed Forces under
7 his jurisdiction to prepare courses, fields, and rinks,
8 maintain avalanche control, and provide communica-
9 tions;

10 (2) lend necessary equipment; and

1 (3) provide such other support as he considers
2 appropriate.

3 (b) The Secretary of the military department concerned
4 may spend such funds for the purposes of this section as
5 Congress may specifically appropriate for those purposes.
6 He may acquire and utilize such supplies, materiel, and
7 equipment as he determines to be necessary to provide the
8 support authorized by this section.

9 (c) The authority provided to the Secretaries of the
10 military departments by this section is permissive and not
11 mandatory.

12 SEC. 2. Out of moneys appropriated by Congress for the
13 specific purpose, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to
14 the Organizing Committee, VIII Olympic Winter Games,
15 Squaw Valley, California, U. S. A. 1960, Incorporated, a
16 nonprofit corporation of the State of California, at its request,
17 funds sufficient to construct, on land of the United States in
18 Squaw Valley, Placer County, California, a sports arena
19 suitable for the conduct of sports and appropriate ceremonies
20 in connection with the VIII Olympic Winter Games. The
21 expenditure of such funds by the committee is subject to such
22 audit as the Comptroller General of the United States may
23 prescribe.

85TH CONGRESS
2d Session

H. R. 10695

A BILL

To authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

By Mr. MULLER of California

FEBRUARY 13, 1958

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

85TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 10713

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 13, 1958

Mr. SHELLEY introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

A BILL

To authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 That (a) notwithstanding any other provision of law, the
4 Secretary of a military department may, with respect to the
5 VIII Olympic Winter Games—

6 (1) permit personnel of the Armed Forces under
7 his jurisdiction to prepare courses, fields, and rinks,
8 maintain avalanche control, and provide communica-
9 tions;

10 (2) lend necessary equipment; and

1 (3) provide such other support as he considers
2 appropriate.

3 (b) The Secretary of the military department con-
4 cerned may spend such funds for the purposes of this section
5 as Congress may specifically appropriate for those purposes.
6 He may acquire and utilize such supplies, materiel, and
7 equipment as he determines to be necessary to provide the
8 support authorized by this section.

9 (c) The authority provided to the Secretaries of the
10 military departments by this section is permissive and not
11 mandatory.

12 SEC. 2. Out of moneys appropriated by Congress for the
13 specific purpose, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to
14 the Organizing Committee, VIII Olympic Winter Games,
15 Squaw Valley, California, U. S. A. 1960, Incorporated, a
16 nonprofit corporation of the State of California, at its request,
17 funds sufficient to construct, on land of the United States in
18 Squaw Valley, Placer County, California, a sports arena
19 suitable for the conduct of sports and appropriate ceremonies
20 in connection with the VIII Olympic Winter Games. The
21 expenditure of such funds by the committee is subject to
22 such audit as the Comptroller General of the United States
23 may prescribe.

A BILL

To authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

By Mr. SHELLY

FEBRUARY 13, 1958

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

85TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 10729

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 13, 1958

Mr. McDONOUGH introduced the following bill ; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

A BILL

To authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That (a) notwithstanding any other provision of law, the
4 Secretary of a military department may, with respect to the
5 VIII Olympic Winter Games—

6 (1) permit personnel of the Armed Forces under
7 his jurisdiction to prepare courses, fields, and rinks,
8 maintain avalanche control, and provide communica-
9 tions;

10 (2) lend necessary equipment; and

1 (3) provide such other support as he considers ap-
2 propriate.

3 (b) The Secretary of the military department concerned
4 may spend such funds for the purposes of this section as Con-
5 gress may specifically appropriate for those purposes. He
6 may acquire and utilize such supplies, materiel, and equip-
7 ment as he determines to be necessary to provide the sup-
8 port authorized by this section.

9 (c) The authority provided to the Secretaries of the
10 military departments by this section is permissive and not
11 mandatory.

12 SEC. 2. Out of moneys appropriated by Congress for
13 the specific purpose, the Secretary of Defense shall provide
14 to the Organizing Committee, VIII Olympic Winter Games,
15 Squaw Valley, California, U. S. A. 1960, Incorporated, a
16 nonprofit corporation of the State of California, at its re-
17 quest, funds sufficient to construct, on land of the United
18 States in Squaw Valley, Placer County, California, a sports
19 arena suitable for the conduct of sports and appropriate
20 ceremonies in connection with the VIII Olympic Winter
21 Games. The expenditure of such funds by the committee
22 is subject to such audit as the Comptroller General of the
23 United States may prescribe.

85TH CONGRESS
2d Session

H. R. 10729

A BILL

To authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

By Mr. McDONOUGH

FEBRUARY 13, 1958

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

85TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

H. R. 10753

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FEBRUARY 17, 1958

Mr. ENGLE introduced the following bill; which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services

A BILL

To authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That (a), notwithstanding any other provision of law, the
4 Secretary of a military department may, with respect to
5 the VIII Olympic Winter Games—

6 (1) permit personnel of the Armed Forces under
7 his jurisdiction to prepare courses, fields, and rinks,
8 maintain avalanche control, and provide communications;

9 (2) lend necessary equipment; and

10 (3) provide such other support as he considers
11 appropriate.

1 (b) The Secretary of the military department con-
2 cerned may spend such funds for the purposes of this sec-
3 tion as Congress may specifically appropriate for those
4 purposes. He may acquire and utilize such supplies, mate-
5 rial, and equipment as he determines to be necessary to
6 provide the support authorized by this section.

7 (c) The authority provided to the Secretaries of the
8 military departments by this section is permissive and not
9 mandatory.

10 SEC. 2. Out of moneys appropriated by Congress for
11 the specific purpose, the Secretary of Defense shall provide
12 to the organizing committee, VIII Olympic Winter Games,
13 Squaw Valley, California, U. S. A. 1960, Incorporated, a
14 nonprofit corporation of the State of California, at its request,
15 funds sufficient to construct, on land of the United States
16 in Squaw Valley, Placer County, California, a sports arena
17 suitable for the conduct of sports and appropriate ceremonies
18 in connection with the VIII Olympic Winter Games. The
19 expenditure of such funds by the committee is subject to
20 such audit as the Comptroller General of the United States
21 may prescribe.

85TH CONGRESS
2D Session

H. R. 10753

A BILL

To authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

By Mr. ENGLE

FEBRUARY 17, 1958

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

5. ECONOMIC COMMITTEE. Received the 1958 Joint Economic Report from the Joint Economic Committee (H. Rept. 1409). p. 2677
6. CIVIL DEFENSE. Both Houses received from the Civil Defense Administration a proposed bill "to extend the provisions of title III of the Federal Civil Defense Act of 1950, as amended"; to Armed Services Committees. pp. 2571, 2677
7. FOREIGN TRADE. Passed as reported H. R. 5005, to suspend for two years the duty on crude chicory, and establish a new basic statutory rate of two cents per pound for chicory. p. 2650
8. FARM BUREAU. Rep. Abernethy paid tribute to the late Edward A. O'Neal, former president of the American Farm Bureau Federation. pp. 2652-53
9. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack announced that the Consent Calendar will be called Mon., Mar. 3, followed by consideration of the Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill Tues., and on Wed., Thurs., and Fri., H. R. 8002, the accrued expenditure budget bill, H. R. 376, to prohibit trading in onion futures, H. R. 4504, the wholesale terminal market facilities bill, and S. 497, the rivers and harbors, and flood control bill. p. 2651
10. ADJOURNED until Mon., Mar. 3. p. 2677

SENATE

11. FARM PROGRAM. Sen. Watkins contended criticism of the Secretary should be directed against the legislation he enforces, and inserted three editorials and two articles commending the Secretary. pp. 2636-8
Sen. Humphrey inserted resolutions of the Central Minn. Creamery Operators & Dairymen's Ass'n, urging continuance of present dairy support prices, support for the school-lunch milk program, and favoring amendment of the milk-marketing orders including downward revision of prices when production exceeds 115% of market requirements and elimination of restrictions on receiving milk from outside the milkshed. pp. 2572-3
Sen. Hill commended the life of Edward A. O'Neal, former President of the American Farm Bureau Federation, who died Feb. 26. p. 2616
12. FARM INCOME. Sen. Proxmire criticized the Department's statistics on farm income and contended that per capita income had not risen, alleging that the estimate of an 8% drop in farm population is not borne out by the evidence which showed only a 2.3% drop in the number of farms. p. 2582
13. FORESTS. The Armed Services Committee ordered reported with amendments S. 3262, to authorize Federal grants to construct Olympic facilities for the 1960 winter games on Forest Service land. p. D150
14. FARM LOANS. Sen. Watkins commended the FHA program in Utah for its assistance to owners of small farms, and inserted a letter from State Director Anderson on the work done in the state in July-Dec. 1957. p. 2636
15. POSTAL RATES. Continued debate on H. R. 5836, to readjust postal rates. pp. 2583-2609, 2616, 2631-6

Agreed to the following amendments:

By Sen. Javits to reduce cost of local third-class mail if prepared and sorted as prescribed (p. 2586);

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued February 28, 1958
For actions of February 27, 1958
85th-2d, No. 31

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....	10		
Appropriations.....	2,9		
Budget.....	9		
Chicory.....	7		
Civil defense.....	6		
Cooperatives.....	23		
Cotton.....	20		
Dairy industry.....	11		
Electrification.....	25		
Farm Bureau.....	8,11	Forests.....	13
Farm income.....	12	Grains.....	23
Farm loans.....	14	Imports.....	32
Farm program.....	1,11,21	Joint Economic Report.....	5
Flood control.....	3,9	Legislative program.....	9,19
Food surplus.....	26	Libraries.....	24
Foreign aid.....	16,26	Marketing.....	32
Foreign trade.....	7,17	Market facilities.....	9
Forest products.....	23	Onion futures.....	9
		Personnel.....	22,30
		Postal rates.....	15,19
		Price supports.....	11
		Purchasing.....	31
		Reclamation.....	4
		Research.....	27
		Soil bank.....	20
		Tobacco.....	29
		Trade Agreements.....	16
		Water, pollution.....	18
		research.....	27

HIGHLIGHTS: Several Representatives defended, and others criticized the Secretary's farm policies. House committee reported Treasury-Post Office appropriation bill. Sen. Proxmire criticized USDA's farm income figures. Sen. Watkins inserted editorials commending Secretary. Sen. Proxmire introduced and discussed forest products research bill. Sen. Cooper and 9 Representatives introduced and Sen. Cooper discussed bills to prohibit marketing second tobacco crop from same acreage allotment.

HOUSE

1. **FARM PROGRAM.** Several Representatives defended the Secretary's farm policies as a sound solution to the farm situation. Several others criticized his farm policies as a failure in solving present farm conditions. pp. 2654, 2655, 2660-66, 2670-75
2. **TREASURY-POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959.** The Appropriations Committee reported without amendment this bill, H. R. 11085 (H. Rept. 1431). p. 2677
3. **FLOOD CONTROL.** The Rules Committee reported a resolution for consideration of S. 497, the rivers and harbors, and flood control bill. p. 2677
4. **RECLAMATION.** A subcommittee of the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported to the full committee S. 2037, to authorize the performance of necessary protection work between the Yuma project and Boulder Dam, and S. 1031, with amendment, to construct and maintain four units of the Greater Wenatchee project, Wash. p. D152

Senate - March 4, 1958

13. BRUCELLOSIS. Sen. Neuberger commended proposed legislation for the extension of the brucellosis eradication program, and inserted a news article on the program in Ore. and the Ore. Dairymen's Ass'n. letter urging the Ore. Legislature to work for Federal funds for this program. pp. 2950-1
14. FORESTS. The Armed Services Committee reported with amendments S. 3262, to authorize Federal grants to construct Olympic facilities for the 1960 winter games on Forest Service land (S. Rept. 1342). p. 2918
15. TAXATION. Passed as reported S. 6, to eliminate claims of immunity from State and local taxes based on contracts with the U. S., where the contractor is an agent of the U. S. in purchasing property for the Government. pp. 2905, 2946-9
16. NATURAL RESOURCES. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported without amendment S. Res. 225, to extend the time for submission of the report on strategic resources of the Eastern hemisphere. p. D170
17. NATIONAL PARK. The Interior and Insular Affairs Committee ordered reported with amendment S. 2359, to change the status of Petrified Forest National Monument to a national park. p. D170
18. SCHOOL LUNCHES. Sen. Humphrey inserted a resolution of the St. Paul, Minn., Area Public Health Council, urging that the present Federal subsidy program for school lunch and school milk be continued until the States can provide the full subsidy and obtain the surplus foods. p. 2917
19. PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Humphrey inserted resolutions of the Crockston, Minn., Farmers' Union local urging restoration of farm prices to a full parity level aimed at giving farmers "a fair purchasing power." p. 2917
20. NATURAL RESOURCES. Several Senators paid tribute to the natural resources conservation efforts of Presidents Theodore and Franklin Roosevelt. Sen. Murray stated that the power companies "emasculated" the 50th anniversary year celebration on conservation to avoid debates on public v. private power, and inserted a statement on Theodore Roosevelt's conservation and water power policies (pp. 2891-6). Sen. Neuberger commended Theodore Roosevelt as a conservationist and inserted various articles on his achievements in setting up the national forest reserves (pp. 2900-2). Sen. Morse paid tribute to both Presidents' work on the national forests and in soil conservation (pp. 2913-16).
21. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Smith, N. J., inserted an article on the work of Point 4 technicians in the Middle East. pp. 2934-5
 Sen. Cooper inserted his statement urging that the United States assist India in meeting the objectives of its 5-year plan by making available up to \$700 million in loans or assistance and urging that India be permitted to pay off the \$170 million wheat loan in local currency. pp. 2938-9
 Sen. Malone spoke in opposition to extension of the Trade Agreements Act, and criticized the recent foreign aid conference. pp. 2939-45
22. WATER RESOURCES. Sen. Ellender criticized a Saturday Evening Post article which asserted that public works projects for water resource development were wasteful expenditures, and replied that with water consumption rising the need was growing more important. He pointed to the value of the work of the Soil Conservation Service (p. 2965), and to the emphasis on river development in Russia (p. 2967). pp. 2962-9

23. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Agreed to call the calendar on Thurs., March 6 (p. 2930). Sen. Johnson stated that any measure on the calendar could be brought up by motion and passed. (p. 2945). He stated that Congress would probably take an Easter recess from April 3 to April 14 (p. 2945-6).

24. ADJOURNED to Thurs., March 6. p. 2970

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

25. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Sen. Cotton inserting an editorial, "Man of Courage," and stating that it "commends the steadfastness and forthrightness of Ezra Taft Benson." p. A1975

Sen. Williams inserted a Wall Street Journal article, "Immovable Mr. Benson." pp. 1975-6

Rep. Utt inserted an article, "Ezra Has Got To Go, Says Politics." p. A199

26. PERSONNEL. Sen. Morton inserted an editorial commending the Senate's approval of a postal rate increase bill, but objecting to the pay plan which would "discriminate unfairly in favor of postal employees as against classified personnel." pp. A1976-7

27. BUDGETING. Rep. Rogers inserted an editorial favoring enactment of H. R. 8002, the bill to place Government appropriation requests on an accrued expenditure basis. p. A1981

Extension of remarks of Rep. Ford opposing this proposed bill and stating that "... hard experience of the Committee on Appropriations over the years shows that this bill, as now written, will cost more money, not save money." pp. A1992-3

28. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Mansfield inserted an editorial, "Loans for Development of Asia and Africa--Plan by Sen. Monroney." pp. A1986-7

Rep. Smith, Kan., inserted an editorial opposing foreign aid and stating that "income taxes are pulling us, the common people, to destruction, and when we fall we will take those who are squandering our life's earnings, along with us." p. A1994

Rep. Gavin inserted an article, "Foreign Aid and Practical Politics; Recession Seen Raising Tough Hurdle for Assistance and Trade Proposals." pp. A1998-9

29. MARKETING. Rep. Anfuso inserted a table showing the comparative marketing margins for dairy products, beef, and pork in Sweden and in the United States in recent periods. p. A1990

30. DAIRY INDUSTRY. Rep. Westland inserted a Whatcom County (Wash.) Dairymen's Ass'n letter urging that the present parity price on dairy products be maintained. p. A1995

31. SOIL CONSERVATION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Mack commending farmers in Macoupin County, Ill., for their outstanding work in soil conservation programs. p. A2004

32. ONIONS. Rep. Church inserted a telegram sent by members of the Chicago Mercantile Exchange expressing their opposition to H. R. 376, which would prohibit futures trading in onions. p. A2004

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN ACTIVITIES BY THE ARMED FORCES IN SUPPORT OF THE VIII OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES

MARCH 4, 1958.—Ordered to be printed

Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 3262]

The Committee on Armed Services, to whom was referred the bill (S. 3262) to authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic winter games, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the bill, as amended, do pass.

AMENDMENTS TO THE BILL

The amendments are as follows:

On page 2, line 13, strike out the words "shall provide" and insert in lieu thereof "is authorized to advance".

On page 2, line 17, strike out the word "sufficient".

On page 2, immediately after the period on line 20, insert the following:

Funds so advanced by the Secretary of Defense shall not exceed estimated requirements for expenditures for the ensuing 2-month period from the date of the request. As completed, the arena becomes the property of the United States.

On page 2, line 21, after the word "audit" insert the words "and control".

At the end of the bill add the following new sections:

SEC. 3. On or before April 1, 1960, any lease by the United States of the property on which the arena authorized by section 2 is located shall be reviewed and lease occupancy thereafter shall include a fair and appropriate rental reflecting the added value and utility represented by the arena.

SEC. 4. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$500,000 to carry out the purposes of section 1 and not to exceed \$3,500,000 to carry out the purposes of section 2 of this Act.

EXPLANATION OF THE AMENDMENTS

The amendments adopt suggestions contained in a report on the bill from the General Accounting Office and provide for a return to the Federal Government on its investment in the sports arena from the use of this arena after the Olympic winter games.

PURPOSE

The purposes of this bill are (1) to authorize the Department of Defense to support the VIII Olympic Winter Games to be held in California in February 1960 with personnel and equipment, and (2) to authorize a Federal grant for the construction of a sports arena for use in connection with these games.

BACKGROUND

The VIII Olympic Winter Games are scheduled to be held in Squaw Valley, Placer County, Calif., in February 1960. The decision to hold the games at this location was made by the International Olympic Committee in response to an invitation from the United States Olympic Association. By Public Law 69, 84th Congress, the United States Government joined in this invitation and urged the International Olympic Committee to hold the games here.

The State of California will bear most of the expenses of preparing for the games. The State has appropriated \$7,990,000 directly for this purpose, of which \$2,990,000 was appropriated to make the Olympic site a permanent State park. In addition, the State of California is spending \$43 million to widen the major highways that lead to Squaw Valley to 4 lanes. The State of Nevada has appropriated \$200,000 for the staging of the games and may provide additional support. The President's budget message of January 1958 recommended that \$4 million in Federal funds be appropriated by Congress for assistance in constructing the Olympic facilities and to defray the cost of participation of elements of the United States Armed Forces in the staging of the games. This bill would authorize the expenditures referred to in the budget message.

The competitors in the games will come from approximately 37 countries. As host for this event the United States has the opportunity to promote international understanding and to give the visitors a favorable impression of this country.

USE OF ARMED FORCES PERSONNEL AND EQUIPMENT

The committee has been assured that the use of Armed Forces personnel and equipment in the staging of the games is only for specialized services that are uniquely within the competence of the Department of Defense. The Army will furnish ski troops and equipment used in avalanche control. The Navy will provide snow-compaction services. It is not intended that Armed Forces personnel

will be used for the construction of facilities or as a replacement for services available from civilian sources. It is estimated that about 160 members of the Army and a lesser number of Navy personnel will be used.

SPORTS ARENA

The sports arena to be built under the provisions of section 2 would be located on national-forest land and would be subject to the jurisdiction and authority of the Secretary of Agriculture. The sports arena would remain Federal property.

The State of California has been granted a 30-year permit to use the land on which the arena is to be constructed as part of a State park. It is the intent of the committee that the permit issued by the Forest Service will provide for the payment by the permittee after the VIII Olympic Winter Games are over of a fee that fairly reflects the value of the use of the arena. This provision of the bill should result in some return to the Federal Government on its investment. The General Accounting Office will be enabled to review the adequacy of the rentals.

COST DATA

The authorization for the use of Armed Forces personnel and equipment is limited to \$500,000 and the authorization for the construction of the sports arena is limited to \$3,500,000.

DEPARTMENTAL RECOMMENDATIONS

Printed below and hereby made a part of this report are letters from the Deputy Secretary of Defense dated February 10, 1958, from the Comptroller General dated February 20, 1958, from the Assistant Secretary of State dated February 14, 1958, and from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture dated February 27, 1958. These letters indicate that enactment of this measure would be in accord with the program of the President. Suggestions contained in the letter from the Comptroller General have been adopted.

THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE,
Washington, February 10, 1958.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is enclosed a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1958 and it has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. It is recommended that the proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation is designed to enable the Department of Defense to support the conduct of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, to be held at Squaw Valley, Calif., during February 1960. Because

of the difficulties peculiar to staging winter games in such mountainous areas, military support is required.

By the joint resolution of June 13, 1955, chapter 138 (69 Stat. 131), the Congress invited the International Olympic Committee to hold the VIII Olympic Winter Games in Squaw Valley. This invitation was accepted and the United States has the responsibility of acting as host nation at those games.

Section 1 authorizes the Department of Defense to assist the VIII Olympic Winter Games Organizing Committee by providing personnel, equipment, and supplies for the preparation of courses, fields, and rinks; avalanche control; communications; transportation (through the use of special vehicles designed to operate in heavy snow); and snow compaction; and for the loan of communications equipment and housekeeping supplies.

To provide this support, it will be necessary to move military personnel and equipment to Squaw Valley and establish an Arctic-tent camp for quartering, feeding, and administering this group separate from their parent installations. It is estimated that 160 Army personnel and a smaller number of Navy personnel will be required.

For a number of years, the Armed Forces have been engaged in research and training for operations in mountain and cold weather conditions and are capable of providing the required assistance with a minimum of orientation and training. In addition, some training benefits will be derived in providing this support.

So far as they relate to military support and participation, preparation for the VIII Olympic Winter Games, actual conduct of the games, and the closing out of facilities will cover a period of approximately 60 days.

Section 2 authorizes the organizing committee of the VIII Olympic Winter Games to construct a suitable sports arena on Government land in Squaw Valley for use in connection with the VIII Olympic Winter Games and requires the Secretary of Defense to provide funds therefor out of moneys appropriated by Congress for the specific purpose. As a permanent memorial of those games, this arena would be available for sports on a continuing basis. The United States has leased the area to the State of California, which will operate it as a State park consistent with the policy of Federal-State use of public land for recreational purposes.

This legislation, relating as it does to only special kinds of support, is intended to be in addition to, and independent of, any provision of existing permanent law respecting the training, attendance, or participation of athletes in the Olympic games or other international competitions generally.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this proposed legislation will result in an aggregate increased cost to the Department of Defense of not in excess of \$4 million during fiscal year 1958 through fiscal year 1960. It is anticipated that \$3.5 million of this amount will be necessary for the construction of the sports area authorized by section 2, and that the \$3.5 million probably will be a supplemental request for fiscal year 1958. The remaining one-half million dollars will be necessary for the support functions authorized by section 1 of the proposed legislation and probably will be requested for fiscal year 1960.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD A. QUARLES, *Deputy*.

A BILL To authorize certain activities by the armed forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of a military department say, with respect to the VIII Olympic Winter Games—

(1) permit personnel of the armed forces under his jurisdiction to prepare courses, fields, and rinks, maintain avalanche control, and provide communications;

(2) lend necessary equipment; and

(3) provide such other support as he considers appropriate.

(b) The Secretary of the military department concerned may spend such funds for the purposes of this section as Congress may specifically appropriate for those purposes. He may acquire and utilize such supplies, materiel, and equipment as he determines to be necessary to provide the support authorized by this section.

(c) The authority provided to the Secretaries of the military departments by this section is permissive and not mandatory.

SEC. 2. Out of moneys appropriated by Congress for the specific purpose, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to the Organizing Committee, VIII Olympic Winter Games, Squaw Valley, California, U. S. A. 1960, Incorporated, a nonprofit corporation of the State of California, at its request, funds sufficient to construct, on land of the United States in Squaw Valley, Placer County, California, a sports arena suitable for the conduct of sports and appropriate ceremonies in connection with the VIII Olympic Winter Games. The expenditure of such funds by the Committee is subject to such audit as the Comptroller General of the United States may prescribe.

COMPTROLLER GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C., February 20, 1958.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
United States Senate.*

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Further reference is made to your letter of February 11, 1958, requesting a report on S. 3262. The bill would authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games and authorize the Secretary of Defense to provide funds to the Organizing Committee, VIII Olympic Winter Games, Squaw Valley, Calif., U. S. A. 1960, Inc., at its request, to construct a sports arena.

Whether public funds should be made available to a private organization for expenditure such as is contemplated by section 2 of S. 3262, is a matter of policy peculiarly within the province of the Congress to decide. As a general rule we do not favor the enactment of this type of legislation, since private organizations (such as the organizing committee) are not subject to the usual regulatory and prohibitory statutes governing the expenditure of public funds as in the case of Government agencies. However, in view of the unusual circumstances present here we have no objection to the instant bill although we do feel that it might be modified and clarified to some extent.

We would like to point out that neither section 1 nor section 2 of the bill contain a dollar limitation on the appropriation authorization or a

time limitation on the availability of the funds. Also, as section 1 is now worded it appears that all costs incurred by the military departments in providing personnel and equipment of the Armed Forces for the support of the games, including the pay and allowances, subsistence, and travel of such personnel, and the cost of transporting the equipment to and from Squaw Valley, would have to be paid from the funds specifically appropriated for the purposes of section 1, and regular Department of Defense appropriations would not be available to pay such costs. However, we understand that it is estimated that 160 Army personnel and a smaller number of Navy personnel together with communications equipment, housekeeping supplies, and other equipment, will be provided by the Armed Forces under the authority of section 1 and that it is anticipated that \$500,000 will be necessary for the functions authorized by this section. It may be that \$500,000 would not be sufficient for the purposes of section 1 if the above specifically enumerated costs are to be paid therefrom, and that the Department of Defense contemplates paying such costs from its regular appropriations. If the Congress intends that the Department do this, it appears that section 1 should be modified to specifically so provide.

Concerning section 2, while it appears that under this section the Secretary of Defense may advance funds to the committee, instead of reimbursing it, the section does not specifically so provide. In view of section 3648, Revised Statutes, prohibiting advance payments, we feel that if it is the intent of the Congress that the funds be advanced to the committee such authority should be clearly spelled out. Also, while section 2 limits the total amount of funds the Secretary of Defense shall provide the committee to an amount "sufficient to construct" (i. e., the actual cost of construction), the sports arena, it does not limit the amount which may be advanced (if such is intended) at any one time. It may be that consideration should be given to limiting the funds which may be advanced to the committee at any one time under section 2 to an amount sufficient to pay the progress or other payments on the arena construction falling due within the 2-month period immediately following the date of the advance.

Further, section 2 is silent as to who shall have title to the sports arena and as to its disposition after the games are over. We assume that title will vest in the United States since the arena will be constructed on land owned by the United States. However, we understand that the area containing the land on which the arena will be built has been leased to the State of California and that the State will operate this area as a State park after the games. In order to dispel any doubts concerning the title to the arena, we feel that section 2 should specifically provide that title shall vest in the United States, if that is what is intended.

We would also like to point out that while under the audit language in section 2 the expenditure of the funds is subject to such audit as we may prescribe, since the organizing committee is not a Government organization our audit responsibility would be limited to determining whether the committee's accounts fully and fairly reflect its expenditures and whether the funds were spent for the purposes for which appropriated.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH CAMPBELL,
Comptroller General of the United States.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, February 14, 1958.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
*Chairman, Armed Services Committee,
United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: I understand that the Armed Services Committee plans to consider at an early date S. 3262, authorizing certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games.

The Department of State believes the holding of the VIII Olympic Winter Games in this country can make a significant contribution to our foreign policy objectives. It is of the utmost importance that the United States perform its function as host in an exemplary manner and we are pleased that the Department of Defense is prepared to participate as authorized in S. 3262.

The Department hopes that the Congress will act favorably on the legislation.

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM B. MACOMBER, Jr.,
Assistant Secretary.

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., February 27, 1958.

Hon. RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
*Chairman, Committee on Armed Services,
United States Senate.*

DEAR SENATOR RUSSELL: On February 11, 1958, you requested the recommendations of this Department with reference to S. 3262, a bill, to authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

This Department is familiar with and in sympathy with the purposes of the bill, and has no objection to its enactment.

Section 1 of S. 3262 would provide that a Secretary of a military department, with respect to the VIII Olympic Winter Games may: (1) permit personnel of the Armed Forces to prepare facilities, maintain avalanche control, and provide communication; (2) loan equipment; and (3) provide other appropriate support. For those purposes the Secretary of a military department may spend such funds as Congress may specifically appropriate. He may acquire and utilize such supplies, material, and equipment as he determines to be necessary to provide the support authorized.

Section 2 of S. 3262 would direct the Secretary of Defense to provide sufficient funds to the organizing committee, VIII Olympic Winter Games, Squaw Valley, Calif., U. S. A. 1960, Inc., to construct a sports arena suitable for the conduct of sports and ceremonies in connection with the VIII Olympic Winter Games. The funds would be provided out of moneys appropriated by Congress for the specific purpose and the Secretary of Defense would provide such funds upon request of the organizing committee. The bill provides for the arena to be built on land of the United States in Squaw Valley, Calif. The expenditure of such funds by the committee would be subject to such audit as the Comptroller General of the United States may prescribe.

The site of the VIII Olympic Winter Games in Squaw Valley is within the boundaries of the Tahoe National Forest and the sports arena would be on national-forest land. Accordingly, the Forest Service in this Department has been, for nearly 2 years, actively engaged in working with the California Olympic Commission of the State of California in developing plans for staging the winter games in Squaw Valley. The Forest Service has issued a 30-year permit to the commission authorizing it to use national-forest land, including the sports-arena site, under prescribed conditions in staging the winter Olympic games and establishing a public-recreation area. The organizing committee named in section 2 of S. 3262 is under the auspices of the California Olympic Commission.

In order to avoid possible confusion and duplication of effort it is expected that the Armed Forces, in their activities under section 1 of the bill, will be governed on national-forest land by the terms of the Forest Service permit and plans jointly developed by the commission and the Forest Service. For example, the permit requires the commission to prepare and put into effect a snow-safety plan for the protection of contestants and the general public. The Forest Service has collaborated in the preparation of this plan which involves shooting down potential avalanches with artillery or hand-placed explosives.

Plans for the sports arena to be constructed on national-forest land have been approved by the Forest Service. Since the arena is to be built on federally-owned lands and since S. 3262 would authorize the use of Federal funds in its construction for use in the games, we understand that the arena would remain Federal property. Since it would be a permanent improvement on national-forest land it would be under the jurisdiction of this Department. Although the present permit issued by the Forest Service does not specifically cover the use of a Government-owned sports arena, there would be no obstacle to amending the permit to provide therefor. The permit provides that use of the area will be reviewed in 1962, which will be after close of the games, with a view to adjusting the fees to conform with fee schedules then in effect.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that enactment of this proposed legislation would be in accord with the program of the President.

Sincerely yours,

TRUE D. MORSE,
Acting Secretary.

○

Calendar No. 1365

85TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 3262

[Report No. 1342]

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

FEBRUARY 10, 1958

Mr. KNOWLAND (for himself, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MALONE, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr. BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. KENNEDY) introduced the following bill; which was read twice and referred to the Committee on Armed Services

MARCH 4, 1958

Reported by Mr. SALTONSTALL, with amendments

[Omit the part struck through and insert the part printed in italic]

A BILL

To authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 That, (a) notwithstanding any other provision of law, the
4 Secretary of a military department may, with respect to
5 the VIII Olympic Winter Games—

6 (1) permit personnel of the Armed Forces under
7 his jurisdiction to prepare courses, fields, and rinks,
8 maintain avalanche control, and provide communica-
9 tions;

10 (2) lend necessary equipment; and

1 (3) provide such other support as he considers
2 appropriate.

3 (b) The Secretary of the military department con-
4 cerned may spend such funds for the purposes of this section
5 as Congress may specifically appropriate for those purposes.
6 He may acquire and utilize such supplies, material, and
7 equipment as he determines to be necessary to provide the
8 support authorized by this section.

9 (c) The authority provided to the Secretaries of the
10 military departments by this section is permissive and not
11 mandatory.

12 SEC. 2. Out of moneys appropriated by Congress for the
13 specific purpose, the Secretary of Defense ~~shall provide~~ is
14 *authorized to advance* to the Organizing Committee, VIII
15 Olympic Winter Games, Squaw Valley, California, U. S. A.
16 1960, Incorporated, a nonprofit corporation of the State of
17 California, at its request, funds ~~sufficient~~ to construct, on land
18 of the United States in Squaw Valley, Placer County, Cali-
19 fornia, a sports arena suitable for the conduct of sports and
20 appropriate ceremonies in connection with the VIII Olym-
21 pic Winter Games. *Funds so advanced by the Secretary of*
22 *Defense shall not exceed estimated requirements for expendi-*
23 *tures for the ensuing two-month period from the date of the*
24 *request. As completed, the arena becomes the property of the*
25 *United States.* The expenditure of such funds by the Com-

1 mittee is subject to such audit *and control* as the Comptroller
2 General of the United States may prescribe.

3 *SEC. 3. On or before April 1, 1960, any lease by the*
4 *United States of the property on which the arena author-*
5 *ized by section 2 is located shall be reviewed and lease occu-*
6 *pancy thereafter shall include a fair and appropriate rental*
7 *reflecting the added value and utility represented by the*
8 *arena.*

9 *SEC. 4. There is authorized to be appropriated not to*
10 *exceed \$500,000 to carry out the purposes of section 1 and*
11 *not to exceed \$3,500,000 to carry out the purposes of sec-*
12 *tion 2 of this Act.*

A BILL

To authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

By Mr. KNOWLAND, Mr. KUCHEL, Mr. MALONE,
Mr. CARLSON, Mr. BIBLE, Mr. SMATHERS, Mr.
BRIDGES, Mr. SALTONSTALL, and Mr. KENNEDY

FEBRUARY 10, 1958

Read twice and referred to the Committee on
Armed Services

MARCH 4, 1958

Reported with amendments

Senate - March 6, 1958

Sen. Proxmire inserted a speech by Prof. Galbraith of Harvard to the National Farm Institute, in which it was stated that the free market and the family farm are antithetical, and that to preserve our traditional farm structure will require government controls. pp. 3109-11

Sen. Proxmire inserted a constituent's letter on the farm program which also urged government payments in lieu of taxes for all Federal land. p. 3111

Sen. Murray added Sen. Neuberger's name as cosponsor to S. 3091, to require wheat price supports at no less than \$2 a bushel. p. 3091

Sen. Thye commended committee's bill to provide 54 million acre corn acreage allotment. p. 3114

2. DAIRY PRODUCTS. Sen. Proxmire's name was added as cosponsor to S. 2727, to establish Federal sanitation standards for milk and dairy products, and he recommended a uniform Federal law to promote the expansion of milk marketing. pp. 3090-1

3. FORESTRY. Passed as reported S. 3262, to authorize Federal grants to construct Olympic facilities for the 1960 winter games on Forest Service lands. p. 3123
The committee report on this bill includes the following statement:

"The sports arena to be built under the provisions of section 2 would be located on national-forest land and would be subject to the jurisdiction and authority of the Secretary of Agriculture. The sports arena would remain Federal property.

"The State of California has been granted a 30-year permit to use the land on which the arena is to be constructed as part of a State park. It is the intent of the committee that the permit issued by the Forest Service will provide for the payment by the permittee after the VIII Olympic Winter Games are over of a fee that fairly reflects the value of the use of the arena. This provision of the bill should result in some return to the Federal Government on its investment. The General Accounting Office will be enabled to review the adequacy of the rentals."

The Indian Affairs subcommittee ordered reported with amendments to the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee S. 3051, to provide alternatives of private or Federal acquisition of the part of the Klamath Indian forest lands which must be sold under the termination act. p. D182

4. SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION BILL. Sen. Thye submitted notice of his intention to propose an amendment to this bill, H. R. 10881, to require 1958 dairy price supports be not less than those for 1957. p. 3090

Sen. Sparkman submitted notice of his intention to propose an amendment to the bill, to authorize the Small Business Administration to loan funds to small business concerns "if the administration determines that the small business concern has suffered a substantial economic injury as a result of programs administered by the Secretary of Agriculture under the provisions of the Soil Bank Act." p. 3090

This bill was made the unfinished business, and Sen. Johnson announced it would be considered Mon., March 10. pp. 3123, 3142-3

5. ECONOMIC SITUATION; FARM PROGRAM. Sens. Johnson, Chavez, Goldwater, Mansfield, Murray, Capehart, Kerr, Dworshak, Revercomb, Johnston, Holland, Case, S. Dak., Fulbright, Humphrey, Carroll, Yarborough, Dirksen, Thye, Morse, and Douglas discussed the economic situation and Sen. Johnson's two resolutions, S. Con. Res. 68 and S. Con. Res. 69, to urge the acceleration of expenditures for

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued March 7, 1958
For actions of March 6, 1958
85th-2d, No. 36

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.....1,44		
Adjournment.....14,27		
Appropriations.....4,51		
Banking and currency....28		
Budgeting.....15,40,47		
Committee assignment....19		
Conservation.....5		
Corn.....1		
Cotton.....32,44		
Dairy industry.1,2,4,16,31		
Depressed areas.....6,23		
Economic situation.....5		
Eggs.....22		
Electrification.....5,11		
Employment.....24		
Expenditures.....33		
Fair trade.....9		
Family farm.....1		
Farm prices.....5		
Farm program.....1,5,35		
Flood control.....26		
Food additives.....20,39		
Food stamps.....42,49		
Foreign aid.....36,46		
Foreign trade.....21,37		
Forestry.....3,17,41		
Information.....12,18,46		
Lands.....29		
Legislative program..13,26		
Livestock.....50		
Loans.....4,5		
Monopoly.....7		
Onion futures.....26		
Pay raises.....25		
Price supports1,4,5,16,31,48		
Public works10,30,51		
Purchasing.....6		
Reclamation.....11,34		
Roads.....17,45		
Rural development.....38		
Small business.....4		
Soil bank.....1,4		
Surplus commodities28,42,49		
Taxation.....1		
Water resources.....8		
Wheat.....1,5,43		
Wool.....5		

HIGHLIGHTS: See page 8.

SENATE

1. FARM PROGRAM. The Daily Digest reported that the Agriculture and Forestry Committee "ordered favorably reported the following: an original joint resolution to provide that acreage allotments and price supports cannot be lower than those in effect in 1957; an original joint resolution providing that price supports for dairy products shall not be reduced below those in effect in the 1957 marketing year; with amendment, S. 2937, providing equitable treatment for producers participating in the soil bank program on the basis of incorrect information furnished by the Government; a clean bill in lieu of S. 2913, to provide for a minimum acreage allotment for corn; and S. 3385, to amend section 114 of the Soil Bank Act with respect to compliance with corn acreage allotments." (p.D182). Sen. Humphrey announced committee's action. p. 3073
Sen. Proxmire stated that the Secretary had the power to increase dairy price supports, under present law, up to 90 percent of parity, and urged him to reconsider his action reducing price supports on April 1. pp. 3108-9

Be it enacted, etc., That the second sentence of subsection (b) of section 403 of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 is amended by inserting after "directors, officers, and employees" the following: "(including retired directors, officers, and employees)."

IMPOSITION OF CIVIL PENALTIES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1749) to amend section 610 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, to provide for the imposition of civil penalties in certain additional cases, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce with an amendment on page 2, line 3, to strike out "this title." and insert "this title;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That paragraph (2) of section 610 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) For any person to serve in any capacity as an airman in connection with any civil aircraft, aircraft engine, propeller, or appliance used or intended for use, in air commerce without an airman certificate authorizing him to serve in such capacity, or in violation of any term, condition, or limitation thereof, or in violation of any order, rule, or regulation issued under this title;"

SEC. 2. That section 610 (a) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, as amended, is further amended by deleting the word "and" at the end of paragraph (5); by changing the period at the end of paragraph (6) to a semicolon and adding the word "and"; and by adding the following new paragraph (7):

"(7) For any person holding an air agency or production certificate, to violate any term, condition, or limitation thereof, or to violate any order, rule, or regulation under this title relating to the holder of such certificate."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ACTIVITIES BY THE ARMED SERVICES IN VIII OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 3262) to authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Armed Services with amendments on page 2, line 13, after the word "Defense", to strike out "shall provide" and insert "is authorized to advance"; in line 17, after the word "funds", to strike out "sufficient"; in line 21, after the word "Games", to insert "Funds so advanced by the Secretary of Defense shall not exceed estimated requirements for expenditures for the ensuing 2-month period from the date of the request. As completed, the arena becomes the property of the United States."; on page 3, line 1, after the word "audit", to insert "and control"; after line 2, to insert:

SEC. 3. On or before April 1, 1960, any lease by the United States of the property on which the arena authorized by section 2 is located shall be reviewed and lease occupancy thereafter shall include a fair and appropriate rental reflecting the added value and utility represented by the arena.

And, after line 8, to insert:

SEC. 4. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$500,000 to carry out the purposes of section 1 and not to exceed \$3,500,000 to carry out the purposes of section 2 of this act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, (a) notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of a military department may, with respect to the VIII Olympic Winter Games—

(1) permit personnel of the Armed Forces under his jurisdiction to prepare courses, fields, and rinks, maintain avalanche control, and provide communications;

(2) lend necessary equipment; and

(3) provide such other support as he considers appropriate.

(b) The Secretary of the military department concerned may spend such funds for the purposes of this section as Congress may specifically appropriate for those purposes. He may acquire and utilize such supplies, material, and equipment as he determines to be necessary to, provide the support authorized by this section.

(c) The authority provided to the Secretaries of the military departments by this section is permissive and not mandatory.

SEC. 2. Out of moneys appropriated by Congress for the specific purpose, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to advance to the Organizing Committee, VIII Olympic Winter Games, Squaw Valley, Calif., U. S. A., 1960, Inc., a nonprofit corporation of the State of California, at its request, funds to construct, on land of the United States in Squaw Valley, Placer County, Calif., a sports arena suitable for the conduct of sports and appropriate ceremonies in connection with the VIII Olympic Winter Games. Funds so advanced by the Secretary of Defense shall not exceed estimated requirements for expenditures for the ensuing 2-month period from the date of the request. As completed, the arena becomes the property of the United States. The expenditure of such funds by the committee is subject to such audit and control as the Comptroller General of the United States may prescribe.

SEC. 3. On or before April 1, 1960, any lease by the United States of the property on which the arena authorized by section 2 is located shall be reviewed and lease occupancy thereafter shall include a fair and appropriate rental reflecting the added value and utility represented by the arena.

SEC. 4. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$500,000 to carry out the purposes of section 1 and not to exceed \$3,500,000 to carry out the purposes of section 2 of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SECOND ANNUAL UNITED STATES WORLD TRADE FAIR

The Senate proceeded to consider the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 509) authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the Second Annual United States World Trade Fair to be held in New York City, N. Y., from May 7 to May 17, 1958, which had been reported from the Committee on Foreign Relations with an amendment on page 2, line 4, after the word "commerce", to strike out the semicolon and "and be it further

"Resolved, That no funds appropriated by Congress for any purpose whatsoever shall be used to defray the expenses of any foreign country or foreign individ-

ual participating in the Second Annual United States World Trade Fair to be held in New York City."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the joint resolution to be read a third time.

The joint resolution was read the third time and passed.

SECOND SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATIONS, 1958

The bill (H. R. 10881) making supplemental appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1958, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. TALMADGE. Over, Mr. President. The bill is not properly calendar business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will go over.

That completes the call of the calendar, and the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business.

PROTECTION OF RED SALMON FISHERIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 263) favoring negotiations with the Government of Japan for the protection of the Alaskan red salmon fisheries.

UNANIMOUS-CONSENT AGREEMENT TO CONSIDER BILLS PREVIOUSLY OBJECTED TO ON THE CALL OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be laid aside temporarily and that the Senate proceed to consider two bills on the calendar which were objected to by this side of the aisle on the call of the calendar. The Senator who had objection has withdrawn his objection. We are ready to proceed now, if there is no other objection, to the consideration of Calendar Nos. 1302 and 1303, which, respectively, are House bill 6182 and House bill 6623.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Georgia? Without objection, the unfinished business will be temporarily laid aside and the Senate will proceed to the consideration of House bill 6182 and House bill 6623, which were previously objected to.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO FORMER OWNERS

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 6182) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States to the former owners thereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill is open to amendment.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, is this the unfinished business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. No. The Senate has recurred to two items on the calendar, to which objection was made

when the calendar was called. The objections have been withdrawn.

House bill 6182 is open to amendment. If there be no amendment to be proposed, the question is on the third reading and passage of the bill.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN REAL PROPERTY TO THE WOODS HOLE YACHT CLUB, MASSACHUSETTS

Mr. TALMADGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 1303, House bill 6623, to which objection was made when the calendar was called. The objection has been withdrawn.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be stated by title for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill (H. R. 6623) to provide for the conveyance of certain real property of the United States in Massachusetts to the Woods Hole Yacht Club.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PROTECTION OF RED SALMON FISHERIES

Mr. TALMADGE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business which will be stated by title.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A resolution (S. Res. 263) favoring negotiations with the Government of Japan for the protection of the red salmon fisheries.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, first of all I wish to express my appreciation for the prompt action of the Committee on Foreign Relations in connection with the resolution. The reason prompt action was needed in this case is that the Department of the Interior, through its Fish and Wildlife Service, will promulgate certain rules and regulations on this subject in about 2 or 3 weeks. Already some hearings have been held, and within a short time the fishermen who fish for Alaskan salmon will know where they may fish, how much they may fish, and the dates on which they may fish. The rules and regulations are based largely upon the supply of the salmon and on conservation programs and practices which seem to be called for in the light of the yearly situation.

In the meantime, something needs to be done with reference to the whole subject as it relates not only to our relations with Japan, but also with reference to a

treaty we have with Japan and Canada on the subject.

I should like to call to the attention of my colleagues the growing concern of people on the west coast and in Alaska over this situation, which involves mainly the Japanese fishermen intercepting Alaskan and Pacific Coast salmon on the high seas.

Often in the past, I have brought to the attention of the Senate matters which were of grave importance to American fisheries generally—not only the Alaskan salmon fisheries—and in most cases in the past Congress has been quite sympathetic to the needs of the fishermen.

Today, however, we have reached a point where not only action is needed almost immediately, but where our valuable salmon fisheries of Alaska and the Pacific Coast may cease to exist unless an understanding is reached between the United States and Japan for a cessation of salmon fishing on the high seas, or at least the establishment of a no-man's land or a twilight zone affecting which further rules and regulations may be promulgated.

During the past few years, the records reveal, the Japanese fishermen have extended an all-out effort to exploit salmon feeding on the high seas far from their homeland, and have taken a tremendous toll of these fish which were destined to return to streams in Alaska and the Pacific Northwest.

As the Japanese fishermen increased their take of the salmon on the high seas, the catch of our fishermen began to fall off sharply. That is not a coincidence. Last year, the Japanese caught more than 55 million salmon in the Aleutian area, and at the same time United States fishermen failed to meet expenses because their catches were so poor. I might say that that number 55 million salmon is according to the figures released by the Japanese themselves. I do not know how many more there might have been which they could not count, but that figure is according to their own count, which I assume to be a very conservative figure.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. Fulbright] has just asked, quizzically, "55 million?" Yes; 55 million. At the same time, the United States fishermen have failed in most cases to meet their expenses.

As most of my colleagues in the Senate know, I have never shed many crocodile tears for our fishermen, most of whom have been doing a very profitable business as a rule. However, since the Japanese effort has been going on, most of them have failed even to meet the expense of going up to the Behring Sea and other points in Alaska to fish, and the salmon catches have been decreasing year after year, until the year before last the catch was the lowest in all the recorded history of salmon fishing.

What concerns me is that the open-door trade policy in this particular case may be a great factor, and under it Japan can not only catch our fish, but can dispose of them on our markets at handsome profits, without the require-

ment of paying any duty. The present occupant of the chair [Mr. PAYNE] is quite familiar with the plight of our fishermen, who have been seriously hurt. It is not that we are necessarily against a good free-trade policy, but that we are opposed to the inequities that are involved generally in the fishing problem.

Our tuna fleet on the West Coast is dead. I read in a fish trade paper only the other day that of the immense tuna fleet which is quartered at San Pedro, only three ships put to sea during the past month. The remainder of that fleet is lying idle at the docks. Because of the imports of tuna from Japan, duty free, frozen or fresh, the price of tuna is down to \$270 a ton. No American fisherman can even afford to pay a part of his expenses by selling tuna at such a price.

The facts are not exactly the same with reference to salmon. There is a duty on canned salmon. None of us has any objection to that, although it is subject to some adjustment. Much of the canned salmon is canned in Japan under conditions which the American housewife would not particularly relish. If there were a food and drug act in effect in Japan comparable to the act under which canneries in the United States must work, none of the Japanese canned salmon would ever get on the American market. It becomes a vicious circle when so much of the salmon that spawn on the North American Continent are caught on the high seas and taken back to Japan, canned there, and then shipped to the United States, to the detriment of our fishing industry, whether it be the canning or other aspects of the industry.

The Fish and Wildlife Service, charged with managing fisheries in Alaska, recently informed our fishermen that they will be forced to close down our Bristol Bay fisheries this year if the Japanese fishermen continue their efforts to intercept Alaska salmon as they did during the past season. All our efforts to build up and conserve these valuable salmon runs over the years will be lost.

We were informed that through our participation in the North Pacific Fisheries Treaty with Canada and Japan the security of these fisheries would be established, and that through extensive research programs all parties to the convention would be able to balance the fisheries so that Asian fishermen would not be harvesting North American salmon, and fishermen from the United States and Canada would not fish for Asian salmon.

I sponsored the original treaty and the supplemental legislation which implemented the treaty when it was first made. It was our hope that the treaty would establish a line where the salmon could be separated; that the Asian salmon would go to the shores of Siberia and to the northern Japanese rivers, and similar Asian locations; and that the North American salmon, as they moved, would come back to their spawning grounds on this continent. Based upon some research, the line which was selected was the 175th parallel. It was believed that possibly all the salmon on the east side of the 175th parallel would be

85TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 3262

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 10, 1958

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

AN ACT

To authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

3 That, (a) notwithstanding any other provision of law, the
4 Secretary of a military department may, with respect to
5 the VIII Olympic Winter Games—

6 (1) permit personnel of the Armed Forces under
7 his jurisdiction to prepare courses, fields, and rinks,
8 maintain avalanche control, and provide communica-
9 tions;

10 (2) lend necessary equipment; and

1 (3) provide such other support as he considers
2 appropriate.

3 (b) The Secretary of the military department con-
4 cerned may spend such funds for the purposes of this section
5 as Congress may specifically appropriate for those purposes.
6 He may acquire and utilize such supplies, material, and
7 equipment as he determines to be necessary to provide the
8 support authorized by this section.

9 (c) The authority provided to the Secretaries of the
10 military departments by this section is permissive and not
11 mandatory.

12 SEC. 2. Out of moneys appropriated by Congress for the
13 specific purpose, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to
14 advance to the Organizing Committee, VIII Olympic Win-
15 ter Games, Squaw Valley, California, U. S. A. 1960,
16 Incorporated, a nonprofit corporation of the State of Cali-
17 fornia, at its request, funds to construct, on land of the
18 United States in Squaw Valley, Placer County, California,
19 a sports arena suitable for the conduct of sports and ap-
20 propriate ceremonies in connection with the VIII Olym-
21 pic Winter Games. Funds so advanced by the Secretary of
22 Defense shall not exceed estimated requirements for expendi-
23 tures for the ensuing two-month period from the date of the
24 request. As completed, the arena becomes the property of the
25 United States. The expenditure of such funds by the Com-

1 mittee is subject to such audit and control as the Comptroller
2 General of the United States may prescribe.

3 SEC. 3. On or before April 1, 1960, any lease by the
4 United States of the property on which the arena author-
5 ized by section 2 is located shall be reviewed and lease occu-
6 pancy thereafter shall include a fair and appropriate rental
7 reflecting the added value and utility represented by the
8 arena.

9 SEC. 4. There is authorized to be appropriated not to
10 exceed \$500,000 to carry out the purposes of section 1 and
11 not to exceed \$3,500,000 to carry out the purposes of sec-
12 tion 2 of this Act.

Passed the Senate March 6, 1958.

Attest:

FELTON M. JOHNSTON,

Secretary.

AN ACT

To authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

MARCH 10, 1958

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

March 11, 1958

HOUSE

16. PUBLIC WORKS. By a vote of 321 to 81, passed with amendments S. 497, the rivers and harbors and flood control bill, including 19 projects not included in the bill as reported by the Public Works Committee. pp. 3411-73
17. TOBACCO. The Tobacco Subcommittee ordered reported to the Agriculture Committee H. R. 11058 to provide for reductions in the acreage allotment of tobacco farmers who harvest more than one crop of tobacco in a year from the same acreage. p. D198
18. FORESTRY. The House Armed Services Committee ordered reported S. 3262, to authorize Federal grants to construct Olympic facilities for the 1960 winter games on Forest Service land. p. D198
19. MEATPACKERS. The Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee ordered reported with amendments H. R. 11234, to vest in the Federal Trade Commission "certain jurisdiction over meatpackers." p. D198
20. MEAT MARKETING. This office has received a limited supply of a committee print, "Trends in Efficiency in Meat Processing and Distribution," a report from the Consumers Study Subcommittee, House Agriculture Committee. The subcommittee makes specific recommendations as follows:
 - "Technological and economic research on problems involved in reducing meat processing and distribution costs should be increased sharply.
 - "The Advisory Committee on Livestock and Meat Marketing should be re-constituted. A majority of the members of an advisory committee on meat marketing should have experience in medium and small meat processing and distributing businesses. Perhaps there should be separate committees on livestock production, and meat marketing.
 - "Research and educational programs should be undertaken jointly by representatives of employers and employees to discover ways and means of accelerating technical progress and cost reductions in meat processing and distribution.
 - "These great changes in technological and economic forces in meat distribution make it highly desirable that a broad research and experimental program aimed at producing fundamental economies in meat processing and distribution be undertaken promptly."
21. ROADS. The Rules Committee reported H. Res. 50, to provide 2 hours of debate on H. R. 9821, to authorize appropriations for the continuing construction of highways including forest highways, roads, and trails. pp. 3473, 3478
22. UNEMPLOYMENT. Rep. Barrett urged immediate action against unemployment, including tax reductions and removal "of all vestiges of the tight money policy which was the main culprit in bring on the present slump." pp. 3573-4

6. WATERSHEDS. Both Houses received from the Bureau of the Budget "plans for works of improvement" in N. M., N. Y., Okla., and Wis. pp. 3478-81
7. ROADS. Both Houses received from the Secretary of Commerce a proposed bill to "amend and supplement the Highway Revenue Act of 1956"; to the Public Works Committees. pp. 3478, 3481
8. FARM TAXES. Sen. Neuberger inserted a resolution from the Hermiston, Ore., Grange urging exemption from Federal taxation for all farmers whose annual income is less than \$3000. p. 3481
9. ECONOMIC SITUATION. Sen. Carlson stated that in 1949 tax cuts and easier credit led to rapid increases in national income, urged that the same solution be applied today, and inserted an editorial, "Recession Can Be Stopped." pp. 3488-9
Sen. Smith, N. J., inserted 2 articles on the economic situation. pp. 3489-91
Sen. Douglas discussed the unemployment figures for Feb. and their relation to the economic situation, and inserted a speech by AFL-CIO President Meany urging a tax cut to fight recession, with which Sen. Douglas concurred. pp. 35-3-9
Sen. Kefauver discussed the economic situation and its relation to the monopolistic practices in certain industries, and inserted articles and a statement on business and the economy. pp. 3519-24
Sen. Humphrey inserted an editorial urging the Administration to come forward with a unified fiscal policy, including stopping the Treasury's efforts to emphasize long-term financing of the public debt. pp. 3569-70
Sen. Humphrey inserted articles criticizing the President's budget forecasts and stating that steel output was dropping again after a slight gain. pp. 3571-2
10. PUBLIC WORKS. The Public Works Committee reported with amendments S. Con. Res. 68, favoring the acceleration of civil construction programs for which appropriations have been made (S. Rept. 1376). p. 3580
11. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Morse inserted a series of articles analyzing our foreign aid policies in Asia. pp. 3493-98
12. SMALL FARMS. Sen. Morse inserted a letter he had received, and his reply, discussing the importance and need for more small farms. p. 3574
13. HOUSING. Sen. Morse spoke in opposition to increased interest rates for housing. pp. 3574-76
14. PERSONNEL. Sen. Johnston criticized recent reductions in Federal personnel as harmful in the current economic situation, and inserted a newspaper article on the matter. pp. 3516-17
15. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. The "Daily Digest" states that the "majority leader announced that following action on S. 3418, to stimulate residential construction, Senate will consider H. R. 10021, formula for taxing income of life-insurance companies, to be followed by S. J. Res. 162, to stay reduction in support prices or acreage allotments, and S. J. Res. 163, to stay reduction in dairy price supports." p. D195

March 13, 1958

House

14. WATER UTILIZATION. Agreed to a resolution for consideration of H. R. 5309, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, rehabilitate, and maintain the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Tex., Mercedes division. p. 3695
15. FLOOD CONTROL. House and Senate conferees were appointed on S. 497, the rivers and harbors and flood control authorization bill. pp. 3723, 3752-59
16. FORESTRY. The Armed Services Committee reported without amendment S. 3262, to authorize Federal grants to construct Olympic facilities for the 1960 winter games on Forest Service land. (H. Rept. 1499). p. 3747
17. PUBLIC WORKS. The Public Works Committee reported with amendment H. Con. Res. 285, to urge the acceleration of civilian construction programs for which appropriations have already been made (H. Rept. 1502). p. 3748
18. FARM INCOME. Rep. Reuss criticized the Secretary's statement on the rise in per capita farm income and stated it was the result of farmers leaving the farm. p. 3692
19. PRICE SUPPORTS. Rep. McGovern urged action to freeze farm price supports and asserted that present unemployment levels reflected drops in farm purchasing power since 1951. p. 3691
20. ECONOMIC SITUATION. Several Reps. discussed the current economic situation (pp. 3729-41, 3745-6). Reps. McCormack and Curtis, Mo., discussed the reduction in farm income (pp. 3737-8). Rep. Moulder asserted that depressions grow from the farms, criticized the flexible parity and soil bank programs, and urged more research in increased industrial uses for agricultural products (pp. 3739-41). Reps. McCormack and Curtis, Mo., disagreed about the economic status of farmers (p. 3741). Rep. Dingell urged the Secretary to utilize Section 32 funds to distribute surplus foods to the unemployed, suggested the Congress pass a food stamp bill, and criticized the Secretary for failing to use the present authorities he has to distribute food (pp. 3745-6).
21. FOREIGN TRADE. Rep. Wilson, Calif., criticized the present trade policy of the United States. pp. 3724-6
22. RECLAMATION. Received from the Secretary of the Interior a report on the Spokane Valley Project, Wash. (H. Doc. 352). p. 3747
23. PURCHASING. Received from the Comptroller General a report on the "disadvantageous bargaining position of Government contracting officials in pricing negotiations which resulted from their lack of knowledge of current cost data known to contractor officials at the time of negotiations." p. 3747
24. TRANSPORTATION. Received from the Va. Legislature a memorial urging repeal of the Federal excise tax on transportation. p. 3749
25. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. McCormack announced that the consent calendar would be called Mon., Mar. 17, but that there would be no rollcalls or other business until Tues., Mar. 18 (p. 3692). He announced that H. Con. Res. 285, acceleration of certain civilian construction programs, might be brought up by suspension of the rules on Wed., Mar. 19 (p. 3723).
26. ADJOURNED until Mon., March 17. p. 3747

ITEMS IN APPENDIX

27. RECLAMATION. Rep. Aspinall inserted an article, "Reclamation Crops Keep United States Healthy." pp. A2327-8
Rep. Aspinall commended and inserted an article by Roscoe Fleming, "Reclamation Pays For Itself--Cutbacks and No New Starts Threaten to Stop Reclamation's 55-Year Record of Marking Wealth Despite the \$21 Billion Added to United States Income." pp. A2343-4
Rep. Chenoweth inserted an editorial, "Reclamation May Be In For Revival." p. A2366
28. FORESTRY. Rep. Alexander inserted a statement, "A Request for Hardwood Forest Management and Utilization Research Funds In North Carolina." p. A2328
Extension of remarks of Rep. Hill inserting the report on the operation of the Roosevelt National Forest for 1957. pp. A2340-1
29. LAW. Extension of remarks of Rep. Albert inserting excerpts from newsletters prepared by Rep. Kee explaining how a law comes into being in Congress. pp. A2339-40
30. FARM PROGRAM. Extension of remarks of Rep. Bass inserting three editorials in defense of Secretary Benson's farm program. pp. A2341-2
Rep. Hill inserted an editorial, "Farmer Must Solve Own Problems, Experts Agree." pp. A2342-3
31. MEAT INSPECTION. Extension of remarks of Rep. Dixon inserting a letter from L. Blaine Liljenquist, vice president, Western State Meat Packers Ass'n, and stating that it gives a detailed explanation of meat inspection problems and points out in detail the difficulties which would be incurred if the budget is not increased. p. A2369

BILLS INTRODUCED

32. PERSONNEL. H. R. 11380, by Rep. Dennison, to amend the Civil Service Retirement Act to increase annuities paid from the fund; to Post Office and Civil Service Committee. Remarks of author. pp. 2331-2
33. CCC LOANS. H. R. 11389, by Rep. Bentley, to authorize the Commodity Credit Corporation to acquire title to unredeemed loan collateral without obligation to make equity payments; to Agriculture Committee.
34. PROPERTY. H. R. 11391, by Rep. Byrnes, Wis., to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to repeal the taxes imposed on the transportation of property (including the transportation of oil by pipeline); to Ways and Means Committee. Remarks of author. pp. 2325-6
35. RESEARCH. H. R. 11392, by Rep. Christopher, to create a Department of Science and prescribe its functions, and to establish a United States Science Academy within such Department; to Government Operations Committee.
H. R. 11411, by Rep. Moss, to provide for the establishment of four soil- and water-conservation laboratories; to Agriculture Committee.
36. ANIMAL RESEARCH. H. R. 11415, by Rep. Sikes, to insure the maintenance of an adequate supply of anti-hog-cholera serum and hog-cholera virus; to Agriculture Committee.

Union Calendar No. 588

85TH CONGRESS
2D SESSION

S. 3262

[Report No. 1499]

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MARCH 10, 1958

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

MARCH 13, 1958

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union
and ordered to be printed

AN ACT

To authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of
the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

1 *Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-*
2 *tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*
3 That, (a) notwithstanding any other provision of law, the
4 Secretary of a military department may, with respect to
5 the VIII Olympic Winter Games—

6 (1) permit personnel of the Armed Forces under
7 his jurisdiction to prepare courses, fields, and rinks,
8 maintain avalanche control, and provide communica-
9 tions;

10 (2) lend necessary equipment; and

1 (3) provide such other support as he considers
2 appropriate.

3 (b) The Secretary of the military department con-
4 cerned may spend such funds for the purposes of this section
5 as Congress may specifically appropriate for those purposes.
6 He may acquire and utilize such supplies, material, and
7 equipment as he determines to be necessary to provide the
8 support authorized by this section.

9 (c) The authority provided to the Secretaries of the
10 military departments by this section is permissive and not
11 mandatory.

12 SEC. 2. Out of moneys appropriated by Congress for the
13 specific purpose, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to
14 advance to the Organizing Committee, VIII Olympic Win-
15 ter Games, Squaw Valley, California, U. S. A. 1960,
16 Incorporated, a nonprofit corporation of the State of Cali-
17 fornia, at its request, funds to construct, on land of the
18 United States in Squaw Valley, Placer County, California,
19 a sports arena suitable for the conduct of sports and ap-
20 propriate ceremonies in connection with the VIII Olym-
21 pic Winter Games. Funds so advanced by the Secretary of
22 Defense shall not exceed estimated requirements for expendi-
23 tures for the ensuing two-month period from the date of the
24 request. As completed, the arena becomes the property of
25 the United States. The expenditure of such funds by the Com-

1 mittee is subject to such audit and control as the Comptroller
2 General of the United States may prescribe.

3 SEC. 3. On or before April 1, 1960, any lease by the
4 United States of the property on which the arena author-
5 ized by section 2 is located shall be reviewed and lease occu-
6 pancy thereafter shall include a fair and appropriate rental
7 reflecting the added value and utility represented by the
8 arena.

9 SEC. 4. There is authorized to be appropriated not to
10 exceed \$500,000 to carry out the purposes of section 1 and
11 not to exceed \$3,500,000 to carry out the purposes of section
12 2 of this Act.

Passed the Senate March 6, 1958.

Attest:

FELTON M. JOHNSTON,

Secretary.

[Report No. 1499]

AN ACT

To authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

MARCH 10, 1958

Referred to the Committee on Armed Services

MARCH 13, 1958

Committed to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union and ordered to be printed

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN ACTIVITIES BY THE ARMED FORCES IN SUPPORT OF THE VIII OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES

MARCH 13, 1958.—Committed to the Committee on the Whole House on the
State of the Union and ordered to be printed

Mr. MILLER of California, from the Committee on Armed Services,
submitted the following

REPORT

[To accompany S. 3262]

The Committee on Armed Services, to which was referred the bill (S. 3262) to authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes, having considered the same, report favorably thereon without amendment and recommend that the bill do pass.

PURPOSE OF THE PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation is designed to enable the Department of Defense to support the conduct of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, to be held at Squaw Valley, Calif., during February 1960. Because of the difficulties peculiar to staging winter games in such mountainous areas, military support is required.

The bill authorizes the Department of Defense to assist the VIII Olympic Winter Games Organizing Committee by providing personnel, equipment, and supplies for the preparation of courses, fields, and rinks; avalanche control; communications; transportation (through the use of special vehicles designed to operate in heavy snow); and snow compaction; and for the loan of communications equipment and housekeeping supplies.

BACKGROUND OF THE BILL

Joint resolution

By the joint resolution of June 13, 1955, chapter 138 (69 Stat. 131), the Congress invited the International Olympic Committee to hold the VIII Olympic Winter Games in Squaw Valley. This invitation

was accepted and the United States has the responsibility of acting as host nation at those games.

Provision of support

To provide the support referred to above, it will be necessary to move military personnel and equipment to Squaw Valley and establish an Arctic tent camp for quartering, feeding, and administering this group separate from their parent installations. It is estimated that 160 Army personnel and a smaller number of Navy personnel will be required.

For a number of years, the Armed Forces have been engaged in research and training for operations in mountain and cold weather conditions and are capable of providing the required assistance with a minimum of orientation and training. In addition, some training benefits will be derived in providing this support.

So far as they relate to military support and participation, preparation for the VIII Olympic Winter Games, actual conduct of the games, and the closing out of facilities will cover a period of approximately 60 days.

Construction of sports arena

Section 2 of the bill authorizes the Organizing Committee of the VIII Olympic Winter Games to construct a suitable sports arena on Government land in Squaw Valley for use in connection with the VIII Olympic Winter Games and requires the Secretary of Defense to provide funds therefor out of moneys appropriated by Congress for this specific purpose. As a permanent memorial of those games, this arena would be available for sports on a continuing basis. The United States has leased the area to the State of California, which will operate it as a State park consistent with the policy of Federal-State use of public land for recreational purposes.

Independence of legislation

This legislation, relating as it does to only special kinds of support, is intended to be in addition to, and independent of, any provision of existing permanent law respecting the training, attendance, or participation of athletes in the Olympic games or other international competitions generally.

NO CONSTRUCTION BY MILITARY

The committee wishes to point out that the construction work involved in the support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games will not involve the use of military labor. The construction will be performed, as all military construction in the United States is performed, through the use of private contractors. The participation of military personnel will be restricted, as pointed out above, to areas of activity which are peculiar to some of our military training programs. It is neither the intention nor the desire of the committee to permit military personnel to be used in activities which are normally performable by regular private construction forces.

OTHER SIMILAR BILLS

The unanimity of feeling in support of this legislation is exemplified by the multiple sponsorship of the measure in the Senate. In the

House similar bills were introduced and are supported by the following members:

Mr. Wilson of California, H. R. 10654
 Mr. Hillings, H. R. 10687
 Mr. Miller of California, H. R. 10695
 Mr. Shelley, H. R. 10713
 Mr. McDonough, H. R. 10729
 Mr. Engle, H. R. 10753

CONTRIBUTION BY CALIFORNIA

It should be noted that California in expending its own appropriation of \$7,990,000 is erecting substantial improvements on Federal land other than that on which the sports arena will be located. For example, the Olympic Village costing \$1,100,000 will be erected on forest service land and will represent a permanent improvement thereon. The sewage disposal plant is on Federal property and its estimate of cost is approximately \$500,000. Other permanent buildings of a service nature will be built on property of the United States and will represent substantial improvements at no cost to the Federal Government. The requested Federal appropriation of \$4,500,000 will, therefore, be more than offset by these additional permanent improvements financed entirely by California. In addition to the foregoing expenditures, the State of California is constructing and improving roads leading to the Olympic area at a cost of \$43 million. Naturally, all of these funds are not directed specifically to the VIII Olympic Winter Games, but a substantial portion of the expenditure will be so directed.

"SQUAW VALLEY"

It will be noted that the bill refers to "Squaw Valley, Placer County, Calif.," as the site of the sports arena to be constructed for the winter games. Testimony given to the committee indicates that the National Board of Geographic Names recently rendered a decision that Squaw Valley, Fresno County, Calif., has the right to be so called in view of the fact that for over 40 years there had been a post office and a small town by that name in Fresno County. It is the committee's understanding that the officials of the VIII Olympic Winter Games proposes to ask for a post office at the site of the games under the name of "Olympic Valley." The committee did not amend the bill in view of the fact that reference to the true situation in the report would be adequate.

FISCAL DATA

Enactment into law of this measure will involve in the aggregate increased cost to the Department of Defense of not in excess of \$4 million.

DEPARTMENTAL DATA

S. 3262 is a part of the legislative program for the 85th Congress and has the approval of the Bureau of the Budget, as indicated by the letter dated February 10, 1958 from the Deputy Secretary of Defense, Donald A. Quarles, which is set out below and made a part of this report.

FEBRUARY 10, 1958.

Hon. SAM RAYBURN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: There is inclosed a draft of proposed legislation to authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1958 and it has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget. It is recommended that the proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

The proposed legislation is designed to enable the Department of Defense to support the conduct of the VIII Olympic Winter Games to be held at Squaw Valley, Calif., during February 1960. Because of the difficulties peculiar to staging winter games in such mountainous areas, military support is required.

By the joint resolution of June 13, 1955, chapter 138 (69 Stat. 131), the Congress invited the International Olympic Committee to hold the VIII Olympic Winter Games in Squaw Valley. This invitation was accepted and the United States has the responsibility of acting as host nation at those games.

Section 1 authorizes the Department of Defense to assist the VIII Olympic Winter Games Organizing Committee by providing personnel, equipment, and supplies for the preparation of courses, fields, and rinks; avalanche control; communications; transportation (through the use of special vehicles designed to operate in heavy snow); and snow compaction; and for the loan of communications equipment and house-keeping supplies.

To provide this support, it will be necessary to move military personnel and equipment to Squaw Valley and establish an Arctic tent camp for quartering, feeding, and administering this group separate from their parent installations. It is estimated that 160 Army personnel and a smaller number of Navy personnel will be required.

For a number of years, the Armed Forces have been engaged in research and training for operations in mountain and cold weather conditions and are capable of providing the required assistance with a minimum of orientation and training. In addition, some training benefits will be derived in providing this support.

So far as they relate to military support and participation, preparation for the VIII Olympic Winter Games, actual conduct of the games, and the closing out of facilities will cover a period of approximately 60 days.

Section 2 authorizes the Organizing Committee of the VIII Olympic Winter Games to construct a suitable sports arena on Government land in Squaw Valley for use in connection with the VIII Olympic Winter Games and requires the Secretary of Defense to provide funds therefor out of moneys appropriated by Congress for the specific purpose. As a permanent memorial of those games, this arena would be available for sports on a continuing basis. The United States has leased the area to the State of California, which will operate it as a State park consistently with the policy of Federal-State use of public land for recreational purposes.

This legislation, relating as it does to only special kinds of support, is intended to be in addition to, and independent of, any provision of existing permanent law respecting the training, attendance, or participation of athletes in the Olympic games or other international competitions generally.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Enactment of this proposed legislation will result in an aggregate increased cost to the Department of Defense of not in excess of \$4 million during fiscal year 1958 through fiscal year 1960. It is anticipated that \$3.5 million of this amount will be necessary for the construction of the sports arena authorized by section 2, and that the \$3.5 million probably will be a supplemental request for fiscal year 1958. The remaining one-half million dollars will be necessary for the support functions authorized by section 1 of the proposed legislation and probably will be requested for fiscal year 1960.

Sincerely yours,

DONALD A. QUARLES, *Deputy*.

A BILL To authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That (a) notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of a military department may, with respect to the VIII Olympic Winter Games—

(1) permit personnel of the Armed Forces under his jurisdiction to prepare courses, fields, and rinks, maintain avalanche control, and provide communications;

(2) lend necessary equipment; and

(3) provide such other support as he considers appropriate.

(b) The Secretary of the military department concerned may spend such funds for the purposes of this section as Congress may specifically appropriate for those purposes. He may acquire and utilize such supplies, materiel, and equipment as he determines to be necessary to provide the support authorized by this section.

(c) The authority provided to the Secretaries of the military departments by this section is permissive and not mandatory.

SEC. 2. Out of moneys appropriated by Congress for the specific purpose, the Secretary of Defense shall provide to the Organizing Committee, VIII Olympic Winter Games, Squaw Valley, California, U. S. A. 1960, Incorporated, a nonprofit corporation of the State of California, at its request, funds sufficient to construct, on land of the United States in Squaw Valley, Placer County, California, a sports arena suitable for the conduct of sports and appropriate ceremonies in connection with the VIII Olympic Winter Games. The expenditure of such funds by the Committee is subject to such audit as the Comptroller General of the United States may prescribe.

House - 2 - Mar. 18, 1958

3. APPROPRIATIONS. The Appropriations Committee reported without amendment H. R. 11085, the Treasury-Post Office Departments' appropriation bill for 1959 (S. Rept. 1401) (p. 4088). The bill had been ordered reported earlier (p. D223).
4. CHICORY IMPORTS. The Finance Committee reported with amendments H. R. 5005, to suspend for 2 years the duty on crude chicory (S. Rept. 1395). p. 4088
5. RECLAMATION. Agreed to a House amendment, and with a further Senate amendment, to S. 2120, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct and maintain the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Tex., Mercedes division. pp. 4112-13
6. AGRICULTURAL CONSERVATION PROGRAM. Sen. Carlson inserted a local soil conservation district resolution recommending that assistance for detention or flood control dams under the ACP program be increased to at least 80 per cent or more of the cost of construction. p. 4091
7. STATEHOOD. Sen. Church inserted a newspaper editorial urging the House Rules Committee to report a resolution for consideration of legislation authorizing statehood for Alaska. p. 4090
8. ROADS. Sen. Neuberger inserted a newspaper editorial favoring legislation to regulate the use of billboards along the new interstate highway system. pp. 4090-91
9. FOREIGN AID. Sen. Smith, N. J., inserted an article and a newspaper editorial favoring continued aid to India. pp. 4091-93
10. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Sen. Johnson stated that S. 3420, to extend Public Law 480, will be disposed of before consideration of S. 1356, to transfer certain functions under the Packers and Stockyards Act to FTC. p. 4087

HOUSE

11. PRICE SUPPORTS. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment S. J. Res. 162, to prohibit reductions in price supports or acreage allotments below 1957 levels (H. Rept. 1508) (p. 4170). Rep. McCormack stated that if a rule were reported the measure would be brought up Thurs. or Fri., Mar. 20 or 21 (pp. 4147-8).
12. DAIRY. The Agriculture Committee reported with amendment H. R. 11178, to extend for two years the school milk, brucellosis, and dairy donation (for armed forces, etc.) programs (H. Rept. 1511). p. 4170
13. TARIFFS. The Ways and Means Committee ordered reported H. R. 10112, to make permanent the existing privilege of free importation of guar seed. p. D227
The Ways and Means Committee ordered reported H. R. 11407, to extend for 2 years the existing provisions of law relating to the free importation of personal and household effects brought into the United States under Government orders. p. D227
14. FORESTS. Rep. Miller, Calif., requested consideration of S. 3262, to authorize Federal grants to construct Olympic facilities for the 1960 winter games on Forest Service land, but Rep. Taber objected. The Speaker stated that he would recognize Rep. Miller Wed., Mar. 19, to move to suspend the rules to consider this bill. p. 4158

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued March 19, 1958
For actions of March 18, 1958
85th-2d, No. 43

CONTENTS

ACP.....	6		
Acreage allotments....	2,18		
Administrative law.....	17		
Appropriations.....	3		
Brucellosis.....	12		
Budget.....	25		
Cheese.....	24		
Chicory imports.....	4		
Conservation.....	19,27		
Dairy programs.....	2,12,24		
Farm program.....	20		
Federal-State relations.	16		
Fisheries.....	31		
Flood control.....	6		
Foreign aid.....	9,22		
Foreign trade.....	1,4,21		
Forestry.....	14		
Guar seed.....	13		
Housing.....	18		
Legislative program..	10,18		
Library services.....	29		
Packers and stockyards..	10		
Personnel.....	30,31		
Postal rates.....	15		
Price supports.....	2,11,18		
Public Law 480.....	1,10		
Reclamation.....	5		
Research.....	31		
Roads.....	8,34		
School milk.....	12		
Statehood.....	7,23		
Surplus commodities.....	1		
Tariffs.....	13		
Trade agreements.....	33		
Wheat.....	26		
Wildlife.....	28		

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate debated bill to extend Public Law 480. House committee reported measures to: Freeze acreage allotments and price supports. Rep. McCormack said this measure will be considered Mar. 20 or 21st. Extend special dairy donation program.

SENATE

1. SURPLUS COMMODITIES; FOREIGN TRADE. Began debate on S. 3420, to extend Public Law 480. (pp. 4089, 4113-38). Pending at recess was an amendment by Sen. Aiken, for himself and Sen. Martin, Iowa, to strike out sections 5 and 6 of the bill. Section 5 provides for an expanded barter program of up to \$500 million for disposal of surplus agricultural commodities. Section 6 permits the duty-free entry of nonstrategic materials, in addition to strategic materials, acquired by CCC through barter. This amendment was debated (pp. 4131-38).
Sen. Martin submitted amendments intended to be proposed to this bill, S. 3420. p. 4089
2. DAIRY PRICE SUPPORTS. Sen. Proxmire criticized the President of the American Farm Bureau Federation for opposing the measure to freeze price supports and acreage allotments at 1957 levels, and inserted two letters from Wisc. Farm Bureau members opposing a reduction in dairy price supports. pp. 4086-87

(Mr. ARENDS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS].

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this bill provides for the scrapping of seven warships, including a battleship, on which some \$55 million has been invested. There is some discrepancy in the committee figures. The testimony by 1 of the 2 admirals—and 2 admirals were the only witnesses who appeared before the Committee on Armed Services—gave the figure of \$55 million. The committee report says there has been spent on the battleship *Kentucky* \$50 million to date, and it is 73 percent completed.

The battle cruiser *Hawaii*, 84 percent completed, with \$43,450,000 invested in it.

Two destroyers, about 60 percent completed with \$12 million invested in them, and 3 submarines, 75 percent completed, with \$12.5 million invested in them.

A question I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Armed Services is this: Are we providing any money to foreign countries to build warships under the mutual assistance program?

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I am not certain. I personally know of no money that is being used under the mutual assistance program for the purpose of building any ships. As a matter of fact, may I say that we have been trying to give away some relatively obsolete ships and we have been unable to get certain countries to take them.

Let me say this to my good friend from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] for whom I have the highest respect, because of his outstanding ability. I consider him to be one of the best legislators it has been my privilege to serve with. This bill is on sound grounds. We cannot afford to waste \$136,000 a year in maintenance of 7 ships, from which we cannot get any use.

Mr. GROSS. I deeply appreciate the complimentary remarks of the gentleman from Georgia, one of the most experienced and esteemed Members of the House. My concern is this: We gave the French some ships. Are we going to be called upon one of these days to turn around and construct ships for some of these foreign countries under some facet of the foreign aid program? I want to be doubly sure we are not going to do that.

Mr. VINSON. Of course, the gentleman must recognize the fact that foreign aid does not come under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Armed Services. But I can say that as far as I know of what goes on under that program, there is nothing in it for warships to be built. But we do have in our mothball fleet a large number of ships. Some of these we have loaned or given to other countries under certain conditions.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the gentleman whether the price of scrap is still \$45 a ton?

Mr. VINSON. Unfortunately it has gone down. If I had gotten this bill passed last year we could have received a million dollars more for scrap than we

would get today. When I prepared my statement last July I estimated the scrap value at \$3 million. The scrap value today would be \$2 million. I so stated in my remarks.

Mr. GROSS. So that with the decrease in the price of scrap we would not get \$3 million?

Mr. VINSON. Two million dollars now.

Mr. GROSS. Instead of \$3 million we would only get \$2 million?

Mr. VINSON. For scrap, yes. Over \$3 million when salvage is added.

Mr. GROSS. Do I understand the *Kentucky* was completed virtually, except for her superstructure? Her machinery and everything else in the *Kentucky* was new?

Mr. VINSON. About 73 percent. We have absolutely no military need for battleships now. We have them tied up in the mothball fleet.

Mr. GROSS. I am not talking in terms of battleships only. I am talking in terms of using this nearly completed battleship as a platform for the launching of guided missiles.

Mr. VINSON. It is not practical to do that. I stated it would cost \$153 million to convert the *Kentucky* to a guided-missile ship. We explored that field thoroughly. No one wanted to get rid of the *Kentucky*. I was proud to have the privilege of introducing a bill for her back in 1940. But we just cannot use the ship now.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] has expired.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I asked for this time in order that I may ask the chairman of the committee this question. Is there any expectation that these ships will be replaced with something else?

Mr. VINSON. No; not a single one of these ships will ever be replaced by any comparable ship.

Mr. HOFFMAN. What would we be doing?

Mr. VINSON. We will be doing this. We will be building nuclear-powered submarines in which we hope to be able to carry the Polaris missile. We will be building guided-missile ships, we will be building airplane carriers to take the place of the old battleships.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Carriers? The gentleman means to fly through the air, or just what?

Mr. VINSON. No; carry us on the sea.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Are we going to have any air carriers that will launch other planes?

Mr. VINSON. If you are referring to ships, yes; we are building a nuclear one now that we authorized last year. We want to try to save every dollar we can. The gentleman and I and our friend from Iowa want to be economical.

Mr. HOFFMAN. One reason I was asking that is because, going over some things in the office this morning, I no-

ticed this. This has to do with operations in the air. It is a little old, but the policy then announced still continues. This was in February of 1937. It is a quotation from Homer Martin, who was then the president of the UAW in Detroit. He was talking about the people who were building planes in California. This is what he said:

If Douglas expects people to ride in his airplanes with a feeling of security, he should have good will in his plant.

Which, being interpreted, means that you let the union dictate operations and determine what the wages, hours and working conditions, and how long the hours of work should be.

The gentleman, I know, is very able and has had a very great deal of experience. Will there be opportunity for men like Homer Martin—he is still around, but he does not have the authority he then had; he was succeeded by R. J. Thomas and then by Walter Reuther—will there be any opportunity for people with their views to determine how the planes are made and what the cost is to be?

Mr. VINSON. I say that ordinarily I would find myself in the same frame of mind as the distinguished gentleman from Michigan on all such questions.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There was another thought. There was John Anderson, who was the Communist candidate for Governor of Michigan in 1934. He was talking about one of the manufacturers at Flint. He said:

"The union has given General Motors _____."

I wonder, will that or a similar situation be permitted when we get into the production of submarines and other implements of defense?

Mr. VINSON. The gentleman's question is not very much allied to the bill.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, yes; let me interrupt the gentleman there. It is very important because it has to do with the cost.

Mr. VINSON. The cost is not involved except for the cost of the scrap, but I want to say this, that I am happy to say that I find myself again in almost complete harmony with the philosophy of the distinguished gentleman from Michigan on this subject matter.

Mr. HOFFMAN. There is the cost of replacement. There is another thought. At the same time in that same year, Homer Martin, who was President of UAW, said that his organization—you will find this all in the daily press intended to purge the Communists in the unions. He intended, he said, to transfer Mortimer, Reuther, and Kraus to other territory and get them out of Detroit. But of course he was not successful because Reuther stayed there. They were charged at one time by the President of the UAW with the destruction of the property of a company that was making the things that were readying us for war.

Mr. VINSON. I still find myself in agreement with the gentleman's general philosophy not only on these questions but on other questions relating to kindred subject matters. I always listen

with respect and admiration to the gentleman's discussion.

Mr. HOFFMAN. As far as I know, every Member of the House has the utmost confidence in the gentleman and his committee, but with the way things are going now, and a 20-year record of violence and destruction of property and the taking over of factories, I was wondering what provision is now being made so that we will get the items that we want and need for national defense.

Mr. VINSON. We have not recently had any trouble along that line in the shipbuilding industry. When it was my privilege to be chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs we had it and we brought bills in here to correct it. My recollection is that some of the legislation that is upon the statute books today had its origin in the old Committee on Naval Affairs. We will cross those bridges when we come to them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Yes; but some of them are in front of us now.

Mr. VINSON. No; not today.

Mr. ARENDS. Mr. Chairman, we have no further requests for time on this side.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Clerk read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy is authorized to strike from the Naval Vessel Register and, according to law, to dispose of the following uncompleted naval vessels:

- U. S. S. *Kentucky* (BB-66).
- U. S. S. *Hawaii* (CB-3).
- U. S. S. *Lansdale* (DD-766).
- U. S. S. *Seymour D. Owens* (DD-767).
- U. S. S. *Lancetfish* (SS-296).
- U. S. S. *Unicorn* (SS-436).
- U. S. S. *Walrus* (SS-437).

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I see on the floor the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations who handles the foreign aid requests. I appreciate that this is a spur of the moment question, but I wonder if the gentleman could tell us whether to his knowledge we are spending any money in the foreign aid program or the military assistance program on warships for foreign countries?

Mr. PASSMAN. Various types of ships are used in the mutual security program. I do not yet know the nature of the requests to be presented this year. We have just been assured by the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee that the partially completed ships to be disposed of through the program under discussion could not be utilized through the mutual security program. But even if there could be effective utilization of the ships for mutual security purposes, it should be understood that the recipient nations would expect us to complete the vessels, which would involve the expenditure of many hundreds of millions of dollars. And, of course, if obsolete for use by our own Military Establishment, the ships would also be obsolete for similar use by the recipients.

Mr. GROSS. How about destroyers and submarines?

Mr. PASSMAN. As I have stated, provision is made for numerous types of ships; however, I do not yet have the information as to the requests which may be made this year.

Mr. GROSS. But, we are building merchant ships?

Mr. PASSMAN. Several types of ships are being provided through previous years' programs, under offshore procurement arrangements. In the issue under debate, I must personally rely upon the information given by the distinguished chairman of the Armed Services Committee, to the effect that the type of ships for which disposal is being sought cannot be used in the mutual security program. I do not have any information to the contrary.

Mr. GROSS. But to the gentleman's knowledge, we are furnishing no funds in any way for the building of combat ships for any foreign countries?

Mr. PASSMAN. Not for warships, as such.

Mr. GROSS. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, we understand clearly what this legislation provides. Seven ships, in which the taxpayers of this country have \$118 million invested, will be scrapped for a total return of some \$2 million. I think we ought to clearly understand what the losses have been on these ships.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. VINSON. I think the House should clearly understand this. If we do not do this, then we will annually have to pay \$136,000 and we will get nothing for that expenditure.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

If there are no amendments to be offered to the bill, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose, and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BURLISON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 8547) to authorize the disposal of certain uncompleted vessels, pursuant to House Resolution 483, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VIII OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill (S. 3262) to authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the

VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain the bill?

Mr. MILLER of California. I will be very happy to do so.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from New York please withhold his objection at least until the distinguished gentleman from California may explain the bill? May I say to the gentleman that this bill relates to the winter Olympic games. The Congress of the United States has already extended the invitation to the foreign nations to come to the United States, and under our invitation they are coming and engaging in the winter Olympic games in California. It provides for a \$4 million expenditure. The bill has already passed the Senate, may I say to the distinguished gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Last year we turned down a request from Cleveland for something like \$5 million for operations. Why we should go ahead and take up another one, I cannot see.

Mr. VINSON. May I say to the gentleman that he refers to Pan-American games. This is for the Olympic games. This Congress officially extended the invitation and it has been accepted. Now, are you going to say to the people that we will not provide any facilities if they come here to engage in the Olympic games? We are in an embarrassing position because it is on our invitation that they are coming here.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I must object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state that on tomorrow he will recognize the gentleman from California to move to suspend the rules.

NEED FOR IMPORT TAX ON COPPER

(Mr. DAWSON of Utah asked and was granted permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. DAWSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, it has been more than 2 months since 16 Members of the House introduced legislation designed to put a floor under our domestic copper price. To date, nothing else has been done on a legislative level. I think the Members of this House and particularly the Ways and Means Committee should be made aware of developments at the miners' level.

Mr. Speaker, misery is spreading in our western mining communities. In my district, one of the major copper producers last week cut back production another 12.5 percent, laying off 500 employees. This is the second cut within a 90-day period. In all, some 1,400 men have been furloughed.

House - Mar. 19, 1958

5. FORESTRY. Rejected (256 to 139 not being two-thirds) a motion to suspend the rules to consider S. 3262, to authorize Federal grants to construct Olympic facilities for the 1960 winter games on Forest Service land. pp. 4256-61
6. RECLAMATION. Agreed to a Senate amendment to S. 2120, to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct and maintain the Mercedes division of the lower Rio Grande rehabilitation project, Tex. This bill will now be sent to the President. p. 4263
7. WATERSHEDS. Rep. Philbin commended the Watershed Control and Flood Prevention Act, discussed its operation in Mass. flood control, and urged consideration for the new \$29 million budget request. pp. 4265-8
8. EMPLOYMENT; ECONOMIC SITUATION. Several Reps. discussed the economic situation and the plans proposed to halt recessions. pp. 4246-7, 4263-5, 4284-5
9. TRADE AGREEMENTS. Reps. Davis, Ga., Jarman, Patterson, Burleson, Withrow, Mack, Wash., Van Zandt, Westland, Lane, Saylor, Taber, Moore, Staggers, Rogers, Birch, Thomson, Gross, Bailey, Henderson, Van Pelt, and McMillan discussed H. R. 11643, and other bills to amend the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act to restrict Presidential control over Tariff Commission decisions and extend the peril point and escape clause authority to perishable agricultural commodities and certain national security items. pp. 4268-84

SENATE

10. SURPLUS COMMODITIES; FOREIGN TRADE. Continued debate on S. 3420, to extend Public Law 480. (pp. 4201, 4202-6, 4207-20, 4221-33) No amendments were voted upon. Still pending is the amendment by Sen. Aiken to strike out sections 5 and 6 of the bill.
11. FARM PRICES. Sen. Humphrey inserted a resolution endorsed by several farmers' union locals urging Congress "to oppose the recommendations for still lower farm price support levels," and recommended steps to "restore farm prices to a higher level." p. 4176
 Sen. Symington took issue with the President's statement opposing a freeze on price supports and acreage allotments, and stated that "in making this statement, the President not only takes direct issue with a majority of the Senate, but also with a majority of the members of the Senate Agriculture Committee, including the three ranking Republican members." pp. 4182-3
12. MEAT PACKERS. Sen. O'Mahoney spoke in favor of legislation to "make the Federal Trade Commission, rather than the Department of Agriculture, the agency having jurisdiction to prosecute antitrust and monopolistic practices in the meat-packing business." p. 4215
13. SURPLUS FOOD. Sen. Clark spoke in favor of legislation to provide for greater distribution of surplus food to the needy, and inserted a resolution from the City Council of Philadelphia favoring such legislation. pp. 4181-2
 Sen. Aiken stated that he had been advised by the Secretary that "as soon as it can be packaged and prepared for distribution, butter owned by the Commodity Credit Corporation will be made available for welfare work in the States." p. 4185
14. ECONOMIC SITUATION. Sens. Humphrey and O'Mahoney discussed the current economic situation. pp. 4189-94

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued March 20, 1958
For actions of March 19, 1958
85th-2d, No. 44

CONTENTS

Acreage allotments.1,11,40	Legislative program.....24	Tariff.....26,28
Alcohol.....41	Library services.....30	Trade agreements.....9
Butter.....13	Marketing.....36,40	TVA.....33
CCC.....41	Meat packers.....12	Water resources.....43
Corn.....3	Onion futures.....29	Watersheds.....7
Dairy program.....20	Packers and stockyards..24	Wheat.....23,25
Distressed areas.....39	Personnel.....35	
Economic situation...8,14	Postal rates.....18	
Employment.....8	Price supports	
Expenditures.....19	1,11,20,25,40	
Farm loans.....37	Public Law 480.....10,27	
Farm prices.....11,25	Public works.....4	
Farm program.....25	Reclamation.....6	
Flood control.....7	Research.....38	
Foreign aid.....16	Roads.....17,32	
Foreign trade..10,21,28,40	Soil bank.....3	
Forestry.....5,22,26,38	Statehood.....15,31	
Government ethics.....34	Surplus commodities.....10	
Grain.....41	Surplus food.....13,36	
Housing.....2	Surplus property.....42	

HIGHLIGHTS: Senate debated bill to extend Public Law 480. House passed housing bill. House agreed to resolution to accelerate public works programs. Rep. Philbin commended watershed control program. Sen. Proxmire and others introduced and Sen. Proxmire discussed bill to establish National Food Allotment Program. Sens. Kerr and Monroney introduced and Sen. Kerr discussed bill to extend loan authorizations for flood control and watershed protection.

HOUSE

1. PRICE SUPPORTS; ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS. The Rules Committee reported without amendment H. Res. 505, to provide for consideration of S. J. Res. 162, to prohibit reductions in price supports or acreage allotments below 1957 levels (H. Rept. 1534). p. 4293
2. HOUSING. On a motion to suspend the rules, passed without amendment S. 3418, the housing bill, which contains various changes in the VA direct loan program, including a definition of direct-loan areas as rural areas and small cities and towns not near large metropolitan areas (pp. 4236-42). This bill will now be sent to the President.
3. CORN. House and Senate conferees were appointed on H.R. 10843, to permit soil bank payments to certain corn producers in the commercial area who exceed their corn acreage allotments. pp. 4221, 4262
4. PUBLIC WORKS. Agreed to without amendment, by a vote of 377 to 16, S. Con. Res. 68, expressing the sense of Congress in favor of accelerating civil construction programs for which appropriations have been made. pp. 4248-55

Michel	Ray	Stauffer
Miller, Calif.	Reece, Tenn.	Steed
Miller, Md.	Rees, Kans.	Sullivan
Miller, Nebr.	Reuss	Talle
Millis	Rhodes, Ariz.	Taylor
Minshall	Rhodes, Pa.	Teague, Calif.
Mitchell	Riehlman	Teague, Tex.
Montoya	Riley	Teller
Moore	Roberts	Tewes
Morano	Robeson, Va.	Thomas
Morgan	Robison, N. Y.	Thompson, N. J.
Morris	Robison, Ky.	Thompson, Tex.
Moss	Rodino	Thomson, Wyo.
Multer	Rogers, Colo.	Thornberry
Mumma	Rogers, Fla.	Trimble
Murray	Rogers, Mass.	Tuck
Natcher	Rogers, Tex.	Udall
Nicholson	Rodney	Ullman
Nimtz	Roosevelt	Vanik
Norblad	Rutherford	Van Pelt
Norrell	Sadlak	Van Zandt
O'Brien, Ill.	Santangelo	Vinson
O'Brien, N. Y.	St. George	Vursell
O'Hara, Ill.	Saund	Wainwright
O'Hara, Minn.	Saylor	Walter
O'Konski	Schenck	Watts
O'Neill	Scherer	Weaver
Osmer	Schwengel	Westland
Ostertag	Scott, N. C.	Wharton
Passman	Scott, Pa.	Whitener
Patman	Scrivner	Whitten
Patterson	Scudder	Widnall
Pelly	Seely-Brown	Wier
Perkins	Selden	Williams, Miss.
Pfost	Sheehan	Willis
Philbin	Shuford	Wilson, Calif.
Pilcher	Sikes	Wilson, Ind.
Pillion	Siler	Winstead
Poag	Simpson, Ill.	Withrow
Poff	Simpson, Pa.	Wolverton
Polk	Sisk	Wright
Porter	Smith, Calif.	Yates
Powell	Smith, Kans.	Young
Preston	Smith, Miss.	Younger
Price	Smith, Va.	Zablocki
Prouty	Spence	Zelenko
Quie	Springer	
Rabaut	Staggers	

NAYS—16

Alger	Clevenger	Laird
Andersen,	Harrison, Va.	Mason
H. Carl	Hebert	Neal
Arends	Hoffman	Taber
Budge	Jensen	Utt
Byrnes, Wis.	Killburn	

NOT VOTING—37

Baumhart	Gordon	Radwan
Bow	Grant	Rains
Buckley	Gwinn	Reed
Byrd	Hays, Ohio	Rivers
Cunningham,	Jackson	Shelley
Nebr.	James	Sheppard
Davis, Tenn.	Kearney	Sieminski
Dies	McIntosh	Thompson, La.
Donohue	McMillan	Tollefson
Dooley	Magnuson	Vorys
Doyle	Miller, N. Y.	Wigglesworth
Durham	Morrison	Williams, N. Y.
Evins	Moulder	

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution was concurred in.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rains with Mr. Wigglesworth.
 Mr. Grant with Mr. Baumhart.
 Mr. Buckley with Mr. James.
 Mr. Byrd with Mr. Miller of New York.
 Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. McIntosh.
 Mr. Morrison with Mr. Dooley.
 Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Jackson.
 Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. Williams of New York.
 Mr. Dies with Mr. Bow.
 Mr. Moulder with Mr. Radwan.
 Mr. Doyle with Mr. Reed of New York.
 Mr. Shelley with Mr. Kearney.
 Mr. Donohue with Mr. Tollefson.
 Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Vorys.
 Mr. Magnuson with Mr. Cunningham of Nebraska.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. JONES of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that House Joint Resolution 285, an identical House resolution with that already passed, be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

[Mr. NEAL addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

REFUND OF PREMIUMS BY VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H. R. 9369) to authorize refunds by the Veterans' Administration of amounts collected from former servicemen by the Government pursuant to guaranty of life insurance premiums under the original Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs is hereby authorized to make refunds, without interest, which are due on account of amounts collected by the United States Government by offset or otherwise from persons who made valid application for and were legally entitled to the protection of article IV of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as it existed prior to the amendments of October 6, 1942. No refund shall be made pursuant to this act unless application therefor is made to the Veterans' Administration, within 2 years after the date of enactment of this act and refund hereunder shall not be denied by reason of any other statutory time limitations, judgments heretofore rendered, or any other technical defense.

SEC. 2. The Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Fund may be used by the Veterans' Administration for making refunds pursuant to this act and there is hereby authorized to be appropriated such additional sums as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Without objection a second will be considered as ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. TEAGUE] will be recognized for 20 minutes, and the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] for 20 minutes.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, this bill provides for the refund of premiums on commercial insurance to approximately 8,400 World War II veterans guaranteed in their behalf during the period 1940-42. Later the VA compelled the veterans to repay any sums expended in their behalf. This bill is required by a decision of the Supreme Court in a case commonly referred to as the Plesha case. It involves a total cost of approximately \$1,600,000, of which \$1,300,000 represents new funds.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may use.

Mr. Speaker, I believe the House will act favorably on H. R. 9369 introduced by the chairman, Mr. TEAGUE, on August 20, 1957. On August 14, 1957, I introduced a similar bill. Of course I most heartily endorse this bill which is just common justice and which will not further delay repaying nearly 8,500 veterans the amounts which the Supreme Court has determined in the Plesha case were collected from them in error.

These veterans obtained the benefits of article IV of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940 before it was amended in 1942. Under that law the premiums on their commercial life insurance which they had obtained before going into the service were guaranteed by the Veterans' Administration for the period of their service and for a while after service. This meant a great deal to them because otherwise they might have been unable to meet premium payments promptly and maintain their policies during their military service.

It is true that the Veterans' Administration construed the law as implying an obligation by the veteran to repay any amount which the Government was required to pay to the insurance company in these cases where the veteran allowed the policy to lapse at the end of the protection period and the surrender value of the policy was not enough to cover the unpaid premiums. However, the 1940 act did not spell out such an obligation, and when the question finally reached the Supreme Court that Court decided in United States against Plesha on January 14, 1957, that the 1940 act did not require the serviceman to reimburse the Government. The 1942 amendments to the act cleared up this question and provided that the veteran would be indebted to the Government, but this amendment did not apply to the earlier cases.

Unless the Congress acts to authorize the Veterans' Administration to make prompt payments in all of the 8,500 cases from whom collections were made under the 1940 act, this satisfaction of the Government's liability will be delayed, probably for a long while, until final judgments are obtained by these veterans in the courts.

I agree completely with the Veterans' Administration that it should be placed in a position to make these refunds by administrative action as soon as possible and that purely technical defenses, such as the statute of limitations or the fact that payments were voluntarily made in some cases, should be waived. This bill will provide the necessary authority which the Veterans' Administration must have to move ahead immediately. It seems to me that this should be brought to a swift conclusion and that this bill should be passed now so that these veterans will not have cause to feel that the Government is failing to recognize its obligations.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR].

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, this is an authorization bill involving the expenditure of approximately \$1,600,000 to benefit 8,440 World War II servicemen. They have paid money for the maintenance of their insurance during the time

they were in service, specifically during the years 1941 and 1942.

A Supreme Court decision requires that this money be refunded to them. That does set this group apart, as a class, from certain other veterans.

This bill before us authorizes the money required by the Supreme Court decision. It has been requested by the President of the United States and by the Veterans' Administration. When the matter was heretofore before the Committee on Appropriations for appropriation they very correctly pointed out that they needed an authorization, which this bill is. I think this bill should be passed to meet the requirements of the Supreme Court decision and, further, to meet the request of the executive department made pursuant to that decision.

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. This bill first came to the attention of the committee last July when the President sent down a request that it be included in a supplemental appropriation. The Appropriations Committee properly decided at that time it was a legislative program and asked that it be referred to our committee.

Soon thereafter the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs sent the Speaker a letter which outlined the entire problem and asked that our committee take action as soon as possible.

There has been one law firm in town that has felt the bill should not pass. Our committee took into consideration their views, disagreed with them, and reported the bill unanimously. If that firm desires to do more, as far as their views are concerned, they will have an opportunity over in the United States Senate.

Mr. Speaker, under the provisions of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act of 1940, as amended, it is provided that an individual who serves in one of the branches of the Armed Forces may have the premiums guaranteed on as much as \$10,000 commercial life insurance for the period of his service plus 2 years. The Veterans' Administration administers this program. The act, in effect, is a suspension of the necessity for current payment of premiums as far as the individual is concerned, while he is serving in one of the branches of the Armed Forces.

As originally enacted in 1940, the act did not specifically provide for reimbursement by the serviceman for any loss sustained by the Government, but the Veterans' Administration construed the law as imposing such an obligation. The Veterans' Administration collected such premiums by direct remittances and also by deduction from VA benefit payments. This act was amended in 1942 and specifically provided, among other things, that the premiums must be repaid. The Supreme Court of the United States, in *U. S. v. Plesha et al.* (352 U. S. 202), decided January 14, 1957, that the 1940 act, as distinguished from the 1942 amendments, did not impose an obligation upon the serviceman to reimburse the Government for premiums if paid where the serviceman permitted his policy to lapse.

The Veterans' Administration requested a decision by the Comptroller General as to use of the moneys in the soldiers' and sailors' civil-relief fund for the purpose of making voluntary refunds to persons from whom collections had been effected and which the Supreme Court ruled to be unauthorized. The Comptroller, on June 24, 1957, advised that the moneys in the fund could not be so used, and thus it is necessary to have legislation.

This legislation would involve an additional appropriation of approximately \$1,300,000. The amount presently in the soldiers' and sailors' civil relief fund is approximately \$446,000. Of this amount, a reserve of \$104,000 should be maintained, in the opinion of the Veterans' Administration, to meet the claims of insurers as they arise. The Veterans' Administration estimates there are approximately 8,440 potential claims for refund under the Supreme Court decision. Claims must be filed within 2 years.

Servicemen from 1942 forward have had to pay their premiums or have their policies surrendered in order for the cash value thereof to go to pay the unpaid premiums, and in addition have become liable to repay the Government the amount paid by it to the insurer above the cash value. The great bulk of servicemen of World War II and thereafter have not taken advantage of this provision of law which is a valid and much needed protection for men who have their incomes seriously reduced as a result of serving in the Armed Forces.

As of June 30, 1957, a cumulative total of 90,411 applications for the benefits of the act had been approved, and 772 policies remained under protection. During the period since the enactment of the Soldiers' and Sailors' Civil Relief Act, nearly 20 million persons have served in the Armed Forces.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN ACTIVITIES BY THE ARMED FORCES IN SUP- PORT OF THE VIII OLYMPIC WIN- TER GAMES

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 3262) to authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces

in support of the VIII Olympic Games, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of a military department may, with respect to the VIII Olympic Winter Games—

(1) permit personnel of the Armed Forces under his jurisdiction to prepare courses, fields, and rinks, maintain avalanche control, and provide communications;

(2) lend necessary equipment; and

(3) provide such other support as he considers appropriate.

(b) The Secretary of the military department concerned may spend such funds for the purposes of this section as Congress may specifically appropriate for those purposes. He may acquire and utilize such supplies, material, and equipment as he determines to be necessary to provide the support authorized by this section.

(c) The authority provided to the Secretaries of the military departments by this section is permissive and not mandatory.

Sec. 2. Out of moneys appropriated by Congress for the specific purpose, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to advance to the Organizing Committee, VIII Olympic Winter Games, Squaw Valley, California, U. S. A. 1960, Inc., a nonprofit corporation of the State of California, at its request, funds to construct, on land of the United States in Squaw Valley, Placer County, Calif., a sports arena suitable for the conduct of sports and appropriate ceremonies in connection with the VIII Olympic Winter Games. Funds so advanced by the Secretary of Defense shall not exceed estimated requirements for expenditures for the ensuing 2-month period from the date of the request. As completed, the arena becomes the property of the United States. The expenditure of such funds by the Committee is subject to such audit and control as the Comptroller General of the United States may prescribe.

Sec. 3. On or before April 1, 1960, any lease by the United States of the property on which the arena authorized by section 2 is located shall be reviewed and lease occupancy thereafter shall include a fair and appropriate rental reflecting the added value and utility represented by the arena.

Sec. 4. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$500,000 to carry out the purposes of section 1 and not to exceed \$3,500,000 to carry out the purposes of section 2 of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill, and I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON] opposed to the bill?

Mr. WILSON of California. I am not opposed to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GROSS] opposed to the bill?

Mr. GROSS. I am, Mr. Speaker, unqualifiedly.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman qualifies to demand a second.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, by the joint resolution of June 13, 1955, the Congress and the United States invited the International Olympic Committee to hold the VIII Olympic winter games in the United States—and specifically, in an area of California which has been called Squaw Valley.

The United States, therefore, will be host to these Olympic winter games and will have as its guests some 1,000 athletes and some 200 foreign newspapermen from 37 nations.

The Olympic games in themselves are important from the standpoint of their great tradition. Today, as never before, they have an importance which goes well beyond tradition. If there was ever a time when understanding among nations is important, it is today. And what better way for future understanding could be found than through the close association of fine young athletes from virtually every corner of the world.

And if we are going to be host, let us be a good host. Let us do this job in the way that our country should do it. The State of California has already appropriated some \$8 million in furtherance of these winter games and is spending additional large sums in road construction and improvement leading to the area in which the games will be held.

This bill will authorize the Department of Defense to assist the Organizing Committee of the Winter Games by providing personnel, equipment, and supplies for the preparation of courses, fields, and rinks.

This is high and rugged country in this area of California, and while ideally suited for the winter games, it does present some problems in communications and other allied fields which are peculiarly within the province of our Army and Navy. For example, the Army will provide communications and otherwise assist with its highly trained winter area troops. The Navy is highly expert in the field of snow compaction. Here we have a double advantage of training troops in actual productive activities while at the same time contributing important help in the furtherance of the Olympic games.

Section 2 of the bill authorizes the Organizing Committee of the VIII Olympic Winter Games to construct a suitable sports arena on Government land in Squaw Valley for use in connection with the VIII Olympic Winter Games and requires the Secretary of Defense to provide funds therefor out of moneys appropriated by Congress for this specific purpose. As a permanent memorial of those games, this arena would be available for sports on a continuing basis. The United States has leased the area to the State of California, which will operate it as a State park consistent with the policy of Federal-State use of public land for recreational purposes.

I would like to draw specific attention to the fact that the construction work involved in the support of the VIII

Olympic Winter Games will not involve the use of military labor. The construction will be performed, as all military construction in the United States is performed, through the use of private contractors. The participation of military personnel will be restricted, as pointed out above, to areas of activity which are peculiar to some of our military training programs.

I urge that every Member of this House support this bill for all of the reasons I have outlined plus one additional important reason: If we are going to be hosts, let us be wholehearted hosts; let there be no dissenting note to the invitation which this country has given to 37 foreign nations.

Mr. Speaker, the instant bill was introduced in the other body by Senators KNOWLAND and KUCHEL and six other Senators. It is in consonance with the invitation extended by this Congress in 1955 to the nations of the world to assemble here for these great Olympic games. Preparations have been made for the games. The State of California has been generous in supporting them, and if we are to be generous and wholesome hosts, we should get on with the work proposed in this bill. The urgency of the matter comes from the fact that there is a very short working year in the high mountains. We are anxious to get this bill adopted because they only have about a 4- to 5-month summer season this year and the same next year to prepare the course for the games in 1960.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MILLER of California. I would be glad to yield.

Mr. TABER. I am wondering what it is proposed to spend the \$6 million for.

Mr. MILLER of California. For the preparation of some of the trails and roads, for a communication system, above all for the construction of a rink and an auditorium building that will be on land owned by the United States and which will revert for purposes of public recreation after these games are held.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HILLINGS. Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] for his statement, and I concur in it. I should like to ask the gentleman this question: We spend millions and millions of dollars every year on the United States public information program in an effort to show people abroad our peaceful intentions and our way of life in America. Does not the gentleman agree that this comparatively small sum will do as much in many respects as some of the money that we have spent in sending pamphlets and making broadcasts abroad to tell the peoples of the world what we are like in America?

Mr. MILLER of California. There is no question about it. This is a people-to-people approach. It brings the ath-

letes of the world together, the enthusiasts; we all remember the games that were held at Garmisch and at Oslo and the Olympic games proper last held in Australia. All we are asking to do is to carry on the great American tradition. This expenditure will do much more than the expenditure of a like sum of money in other places.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, I endorse the statement made by my colleague from California. As a cosponsor of this resolution I think it would be becoming for the United States to provide every facility for this great athletic event for which we are the host. This will provide a permanent memorial on this land in the form of an ice arena. It will also provide the means for training our ski troops in an area that may need that kind of training.

It seems to me it would be the proper thing for us to adopt this resolution, and I urge the House to take favorable action.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I think we should point out the continuing benefit of this appropriation. The sports arena will be there as a permanent thing for the use of the people of this country after the winter games have been held. The State of California will operate the Olympic Park as a State park. This is in complete consonance with the cooperative policy between the Federal Government and the States in the use of Government-owned land for recreational purposes. In this instance this will insure continuing public benefits for the expenditure of both Federal and State funds.

Mr. MILLER of California. And may I say to the gentleman that the sport of skiing has increased very greatly and is one of the most popular in our country today.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, first I would like to say that I am a sports enthusiast and have been active in promoting sports throughout my lifetime. For quite awhile I was a coach in a high school. I have been somewhat concerned about getting the Government into these things and I am wondering if the gentleman could tell us whether there is a precedent in this country for this sort of thing?

Mr. MILLER of California. I cannot recall one right now, but I think the time when the gentleman should have asked that was when we extended this invitation in 1955. I believe there have been occasions in the past where this has been done, but I cannot point to one specifically at this moment.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I think the House ought to know what the precedents are, if any, or whether this is something that is brandnew. I should like to say that I was on the House floor when this resolution was passed, when the invitation the gentleman mentions was given, but I had no idea that it was to carry with it any obligation to appropriate money.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for an answer to that question?

Mr. MILLER of California. I am glad to yield to the lady from New York.

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, I think I might answer that question for the gentleman, because in days long past we had a United States horse show team that went to all the Olympic games and did very creditably. That was entirely financed by the United States Government. In my book it is a great pity that was ever given up. So there is a precedent for helping these Olympic games. I think it is a very proper thing for the Federal Government to engage in, especially at this time in our history when we are spending so much money on defense, which is quite proper; but I think it also well to spend a little money for these friendly meetings where we can all get together.

I sincerely hope the bill will pass.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the lady from New York.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to my colleague from California.

Mr. ALLEN of California. Mr. Speaker, I want to join the gentleman in support of this bill. With reference to the question raised a moment ago, the Olympic Stadium at Los Angeles was built as a contribution by the Federal Government for the 1932 games. I should like to say, also, that this type of activity is one in which we should engage, because it brings into this country and brings together from all over the world the young people who are engaging in sports, not only the participants in the actual games, but those of all ages who are interested in sports. It is one of the finest public relations programs in which the Federal Government can be involved.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER], but preceding that I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. VINSON. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 24]

Aspinall	Clark	Doyle
Bailey	Cunningham,	Durham
Bow	Nebr.	Edmondson
Buckley	Davis, Tenn.	Gordon
Byrd	Dies	Grant
Celler	Dooley	Gwinn

Hays, Ohio
Horan
Jackson
James
Kearney
Kluczynski
McIntosh
Magnuson

Mason
Moulder
Powell
Prouty
Radwan
Rains
Rivers
Shelley

Sieminski
Smith, Miss.
Teague, Tex.
Wigglesworth
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. Y.
Winstead

The SPEAKER. On this rollcall 376 Members have answered to their names, a quorum.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

AUTHORIZING CERTAIN ACTIVITIES BY THE ARMED FORCES IN SUPPORT OF THE VIII OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, it is not a nice thing to always have to be on the negative side if you are trying to save a dollar, but that is the way it is. Now, a year ago we turned down Ohio on a proposition to put up \$5 million for a stadium in connection with a similar operation. This is a proposal to put up \$4 million. And, as the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], has stated, it is to be used to build roads and trails so that you can get to this site, which is an inaccessible place near Lake Tahoe, in Nevada.

Now, for my own part, I cannot see just exactly why we should do this. As I understand it, there is still a quarrel on between the promoter of this outfit, a man named Cushing, and a fellow named Poulson, over whether or not Poulson will give up his property, which consists of something like eleven-hundred-odd acres, to be used in connection with this proposition. The whole thing was spread out in the Saturday Evening Post for February 22, about 10 days ago. It tells all about the details of how this gentleman named Cushing lived in this Squaw Valley, which is made up of 30 or more people in the neighborhood, and he was sort of isolated out there in the country and he promoted this scheme to have the next edition of the Olympics in 1960 held there.

Now, we are in fine shape in this country right now. We are in the process of spending money for all sorts of things that we need. We need military equipment and supplies, and we need to have men trained to handle them, and the way things are going we are not going to have a great deal to spare. Under those circumstances I cannot understand how we can afford to put up \$4 million more. Three and one-half million dollars of that \$4 million, according to the committee report and the documents that were submitted with it, will be used for the purpose of building a coliseum.

How they will handle the coliseum I do not know. They say that the Army or the Navy is going to lend them the equipment which will operate buses in a snow-packing operation, with crawlers, to take the people who have a ticket of admission, free of charge to the show up there. It looks to me almost like a fantastic proposition. It is not like these Olympic games that have been held where hotel accommodations were available. It is not like the places where they already have skiways, and so forth as, for instance, at Lake Placid or in 1 or 2

of those big operations in Idaho or upper New Hampshire. This is an entirely different picture and it seems to me we are going a long ways if we attempt to embark upon such a proposition and spend all this money.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. It is my understanding, and I hope I am correct in this understanding, that the State of California will take a 30-year lease upon this property that is to be erected in part by all the taxpayers of the country. Does the gentleman know whether that is true or not?

Mr. TABER. As I understand, that is probably so. As I understand it, they will put the skiways in such shape that there will be an interest on the part of certain people in occupying the place. But they would be up against this. They would have to have these snow-packing operations in order to carry passengers up there. There is no railroad there, there is no way of getting people over the snow. The bill itself provides for that.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. For the purpose of these games, I would assume that the Army will furnish the equipment to haul them around.

Mr. TABER. It may be the Army, it may be the Navy. As I remember it, I saw the word "Navy" in here.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. McDONOUGH. The report, as I read it, indicates, contrary to the views of the gentleman, that in addition to the foregoing expenditures, the State of California is constructing and improving roads leading to the Olympic area at a cost of \$43 million. The State of California is spending that much money, and in addition to that we are putting \$8 million in toward the improvement of the immediate area. It is all being done on Government property. So that access to it is being provided by the State of California, not by the Federal Government.

Mr. TABER. The only source of my information as to the Government paying for the trails and the roads is what was said by the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER]. He stated that to me on the floor just a few minutes ago. That is the source of my information. I wanted to know what the money was going to be used for, and he said that was one of the purposes, in his answer to me. That is the only source of information I have on it.

I am sorry if I have made any mistake, but I was trying to find out what was going on. I asked the question of him and that is the answer I got.

Mr. McDONOUGH. I am reading from the report of the committee.

Mr. TABER. I do not know anything about that, except I have a copy of it here, but I do not understand how they could manage this great big spectacle and get people up there where they would have to pack the snow down and have a lot of traction and that sort of thing to

get there. It says that the machinery can be used for that purpose.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of California. The gentleman mentioned an article in the Saturday Evening Post. I would commend that article to the Members of the House to read, because it focuses attention on these winter Olympic games and points out the importance of the games as far as our international relations are concerned. It also points out that with these improvements we are talking about these represent the finest winter Olympic games that have ever been held. There are many improvements already there at Squaw Valley. We have ski runs and ski slopes, and we have adequate housing in the Lake Tahoe area just adjacent, but we do need an area where these winter sports so far as skating is concerned can be participated in.

Mr. TABER. I understand, and I have just been reading the article here, that while Olympic games are a very interesting thing, nevertheless they cost a great lot of money, and that is what we have to look out for if we are ever going to get anywhere ourselves.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I notice this report speaks about an authorization of \$4 million. Is that the entire contribution of the United States Government or will that likely be requested again in the years to come?

Mr. TABER. I do not have any idea about it. I cannot answer that. They generally come back for a little more. That is my experience. Most of them ask for more money.

Mr. WILSON of California. If the gentleman will yield further, we have asked the young people of 37 different nations to attend the Olympic games. The Congress invited them over here. If we do not provide facilities to allow them to participate adequately, we will be the laughing stock of the world.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman remembers we had this same question up when we invited all the Western Hemisphere in here, and last year the Congress turned down \$5 million, as I understand it—I think that is correct—to swing that proposition and build a stadium in Cleveland.

Mr. BUDGE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. BUDGE. I note that the committee report states that all of the construction will be by the civilian components of the Department of Defense. The bill itself states this in the first section, that notwithstanding any other provision of law the Secretary of a military department may, with respect to the VIII Olympic Winter Games, 1, permit personnel—I presume that would mean suppliers, if necessary—personnel of the Armed Forces to prepare courses, fields, and rinks, maintain avalanche control, and provide communications; and 2, lend the necessary equipment.

I should like the gentleman to tell us whether or not he feels that is a proper utilization of American military manpower, particularly the ones who might be in the military without their consent, in other words, draftees.

Mr. TABER. If we were in a position where we had absolute peace and the military were lying around without anything to do, that might be interesting, but at a time when we are right on the verge of trouble all the time and we have this Russian menace hanging over our heads, that is a poor way to use our manpower.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3 minutes, and ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Iowa?

There was no objection.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, this bill is wide open to the use of military forces. There is no limitation except as to \$500,000.

The gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON] a moment ago called attention to the fact that Congress invited these nations to participate. Let me read you Public Law 69:

[Public Law 69, 84th Cong., ch. 138, 1st sess.]

Senate Joint Resolution 51

Joint resolution extending an invitation to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 winter Olympic games at Squaw Valley, Calif.

Resolved, etc., That whereas the United States Olympic Association will invite the International Olympic Committee to hold the winter Olympic games in the United States at Squaw Valley, Calif., in 1960, the Government of the United States joins in the invitation of the United States Olympic Association to the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 winter Olympic games in the United States at Squaw Valley, Calif.; and expresses the sincere hope that the United States will be selected as the site.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of State is directed to transmit a copy of this joint resolution to the International Olympic Committee.

Approved June 13, 1955.

There is not one word in this resolution suggesting or stating that anyone would come to Congress and ask for \$4 million to finance these games. Now I say to you, if you were dealing in good faith, why did you not come in here with your 1955 resolution and provide for an appropriation? Instead you come before us today and say, "Oh, yes, you invited these people to come here more than 2 years ago, and now the taxpayers have to put up \$4 million."

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of California. We had the Olympic games in the United States in 1932 at Los Angeles. It was stated previously there was no precedent for this sort of expenditure. When we invited the Olympics here in 1932, we built an entire Olympic village to house all of the participants in the 1932 Olympics. This is the usual thing that is expected of the host nation. We are not asking too much when we are asking for a mere \$4 million when the State of California is putting up \$8 million out of its own treasury.

Mr. GROSS. How much did you get in 1932?

Mr. WILSON of California. I do not know.

I would like to make particular note of the fact that California is expending its own appropriation of \$7,990,000 in erecting substantial improvements on Federal land other than that on which the sports arena will be located. For example, the Olympic Village costing \$1,100,000 will be erected on Forest Service land and will represent a permanent improvement thereon.

The sewage disposal plant is on Federal property and its estimate of cost is approximately \$500,000. Other permanent buildings of a service nature will be built on property of the United States and will represent substantial improvements at no cost to the Federal Government. The requested Federal appropriation of \$4 million will, therefore, be more than offset by these additional permanent improvements financed entirely by California.

In addition to the foregoing expenditures, the State of California is constructing and improving roads leading to the Olympic area at a cost of \$43 million. Naturally, all of these funds are not directed specifically to the VIII Olympic Winter Games, but a substantial portion of the expenditure will be so directed.

From the report, it will be noted that Mr. MILLER of California and I introduced bills similar to S. 3262. Bills were also introduced by other members of the California delegation; namely, Mr. HILLINGS, Mr. SHELLEY, Mr. McDONOUGH, and Mr. ENGLE. I know that each of these gentlemen supports the bill as strongly as I do.

After the winter games have been held, the State of California will operate the Olympic area as a State park. This is in complete consonance with the cooperative policy between the Federal Government and the States in the use of Government-owned lands for recreational purposes. In this instance, this policy will insure a continuing public benefit from the expenditure of both the Federal and State funds.

Mr. Speaker, as has already been suggested, let the United States be a good host and show that the 37 foreign nations who will be our guests are completely welcome. The way to do this is to approve this bill.

Mr. GROSS. Well, no matter how thin you try to slice it, this legislation, if approved, will set a precedent. From here on out, Congress and the taxpayers will be financing the Olympic games wherever they may be held. Make up your minds to that when you vote, and I hope you will not vote for this appropriation.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Is it not true then that we would be mimicking some other nations with whom we are fighting and in pretty much of a tussle with these days, who as a government sponsor their entire sports program? One of the strengths of our way of life has been the fact that our Government does not sponsor our sports programs in any way.

Mr. GROSS. I agree with the gentleman.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, no doubt these games will be helpful in our relations with other nations. But if we would only admit that there is some limit to what we can spend, it would be helpful. We were frightened half to death by the sputnik. Almost every bill that has come up since then has been a so-called defense measure. We have been frightened—or used fear as an excuse—I hope we are not so badly frightened as we seem to be—to make additional unneeded appropriations. We have a bill which came from our California friends for \$32 billion for defense shelters for someplace to get into if and when a war comes. Then we have had bills to make appropriations for billions of dollars to prepare missiles, antismissiles, and implements of war.

First it is one thing, then it is another; the request is never the same, but always it is more; we can depend on that.

Just recently, along came this unemployment crisis, people out of work. There is not a Congressman in the House, not a Member of the House, who has not on his desk a stack of letters from people who claim—and many truly—that they just cannot get along on what the State or the Nation provides for food, clothing, and shelter.

Must we have legislation to help out? Sure. Unemployment compensation is good; no one disputes that—a fine thing. But jobs—employment is better. But can we afford it, \$4 million for promotion of games at this time? The expenditure does not seem necessary at this time.

Very soon now we will have a bill before us for billions in foreign aid. I have no criticism of those who want to vote for all these appropriations, not a word; it is none of my business how someone else votes, but, for myself, I am going to pay attention to the needs of those letters that come from home, for aid for people who are in no way to blame for the situation in which they find themselves, for the conditions which make it almost impossible for them to meet their obligations. Some of them are in that situation because they have overbought; they bought on credit, more than they should. But we cannot do anything about that now. They will ask me if I voted for this bill: "How can you vote \$4 million to entertain people at the Olympic games when neither I nor the people dependent upon me have enough to eat, to wear, or a sufficient roof over our heads?" When I tell them we do not have the money they will ask: "Where did you get the \$4 million for the entertainment at the Olympic games?"

If you do not believe that our people are in need, come over and take a look at my file and then give me an answer that will be helpful in solving their problem.

Sometimes I think of the gentleman from Texas who spoke the other day—and I hesitate to repeat his words about our lack of patriotism, good sense, courage and determination; you remember the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], who sat here and whose charge no one denied. Deep down in our hearts we know that too much of what he was saying is true.

I will have to be guided by the needs of my own people even though I may be accused of playing politics, when I believe that the best interests of the people as a whole will be served.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I simply want to reiterate that under the resolution passed by Congress in 1955, Public Law 69, there is no obligation whatever upon any Member of Congress to vote \$4 million for this purpose.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. TABER. I would like to read from a statement by Mr. Cushing, the chief promoter of this proposition:

I, truthfully, do not see the need for such extravagance; but, as far as I am concerned, my feelings will not be hurt if they spend \$20 million.

That is a quotation from him in the Saturday Evening Post.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to my colleague from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I recall earlier when I was teaching school as athletic director and coach that we were called upon to help finance in various ways American participation in Olympic games and help finance the supporting of athletes in various ways. I would like to ask some of those supporting this legislation if any attempt has been made to appeal to the sporting world and those interested in sports in this country to raise money on the outside, voluntarily, to help support this proposition? The people I have anything to do with in the way of promoting sporting activities are interested and will respond liberally if given a chance.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield briefly to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. I think the gentleman well realizes, having been an athlete himself, that the money that is being appropriated here and the money that is being made available by the State of California will not begin to meet the cost of these games, and that, as usual, interested people will again be asked to make private contributions for this purpose.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, evidently the answer is that the public has not been called upon to support this proposal.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. ENGLE].

Mr. ENGLE. Mr. Speaker, commenting on the question just asked, the United States Olympic Committee has never permitted a government of any kind, as far as our people are concerned, to get into the financing of the expenses of the athletes who go to these Olympic games. No part of this money will be used for that purpose. It has been the practice, however, in this country and in other nations for governments of one kind or another to help create the physical facilities where the games are held. That was true in Italy, it is true throughout the world. It was true in Australia. The actual financing of the traveling expenses of the athletes is another matter—and is raised by public subscription.

I am the co-author of this legislation. Squaw Valley is located in my district. In 1955 I introduced a joint resolution asking the International Olympic Committee to hold the 1960 Olympic games in Squaw Valley. That resolution was favorably reported by the House Committee on Foreign Affairs and subsequently became the language of Public Law 69 of the 84th Congress. At the same time the State of California issued an invitation to the International Olympic Committee. In response to those invitations the International Olympic Committee made the decision to hold the winter games in 1960 in California.

This is not the operation of some hot rod promoter as has been implied. The international winter games will be held at the formal invitation of the State of California, through its State legislature, and the Congress of the United States.

The State of California has picked up its end. Nobody argued about what that was going to be. The State of California has put up over \$8 million, the State of Nevada has subscribed over \$300,000. Nevada, of course, is very close to that area. The State of California is accelerating the construction of a 4-lane highway that will cost \$43 million. Contrary to what was said here, there was no intention to ask the military to supply transportation from the main highway to the games. The purpose of having the military in the area is to control avalanches and to enable people to get from the bottom of these slopes to the top. That is good training for ski troops and it is precisely what they are trained to do. The operation of the military will be solely in the areas where the military can operate. Three and a half million dollars of this money will be used to build a ski arena which is going to be built on Federal land of the National Forest Service.

After the games are over the arena and the area adjacent to it will be leased to the State of California which will make a State park out of the whole area. The State of California will pay a rental which is to be determined, of course, later, and which will proceed for another 30 years for the purpose of reimbursing the Federal Government, in part, at least, for its expenditures.

I would not be surprised at all if when we are through with this it will turn out to be a mighty good investment for the Federal Government, because over a pe-

riod of 30 years and even longer this area will continue to be used. The cost of building the arena, \$3½ million of Federal money, will be returned by those rentals. After a period of 30 years, if we look at this investment impartially, we will find that we have sustained the dignity and the pride of America as a host nation for the international winter Olympic games and we will probably more than be even moneywise inasmuch as California is gaining in population so rapidly that we do not have places for these people to ski any more.

I believe that this will not turn out to be a bad investment for the Federal Government at all. I want to call attention to the fact that there is a Federal interest in this matter. It is the interest of the United States Government in maintaining a good face to the world as a host nation in these international winter Olympics, and because of that the President of the United States—and I call careful attention to this—in his budget message and prior to the time that legislation was even introduced, approved the expenditure of \$4 million in his budget message. This legislation implements the request made by the President of the United States in that budget message.

And, I would say further and in conclusion that if you will look at the departmental reports that the Secretary of Defense, the Secretary of Agriculture, the Secretary of State, the Comptroller General, as well as the President of the United States have approved of this legislation and asked for favorable action of the House on it. I hope that that will occur today. I see nothing else for us to do. California is putting in \$8 million to make these winter international games a success, and the Congress is now being asked to put up half that much money.

Mr. McDONOUGH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ENGLE. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McDONOUGH. To supplement the remarks of the gentleman, may I read from the report:

For a number of years, the Armed Forces have been engaged in research and training for operations in mountain and cold weather conditions and are capable of providing the required assistance with a minimum of orientation and training. In addition, some training benefits will be derived in providing this support.

Mr. ENGLE. That is correct. As a matter of fact, if they were not spending it there, they would be spending it some place else to get the winter training. And, with reference to the balance, as I said before, it will not only meet our obligation, but in all probability we will get it back twice over. We cannot invite these people here and then refuse to put up the money to take care of them. California is doing more than its share—twice as much as is being asked of the Federal Government—and we should be willing to do our part to make these games an outstanding success and reflect credit on the United States. No other sensible course is open to us.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and the Chair being in doubt, the House divided and there were—ayes 134, noes 56.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 256, nays 139, not voting 35, as follows:

[Roll No. 25]

YEAS—256

Addonizio	Frazier	Miller, Md.
Albert	Frellinghuysen	Miller, N. Y.
Allen, Calif.	Friedel	Mills
Anderson,	Fulton	Mitchell
Mont.	Garmatz	Montoya
Anfuso	Gary	Moore
Arends	Gathings	Morano
Amley	Gavin	Morgan
Aspinall	Glenn	Morris
Bailey	Granahan	Moss
Baker	Green, Oreg.	Multer
Baldwin	Green, Pa.	Natcher
Barling	Gregory	Nicholson
Barrett	Griffiths	Nimitz
Bass, Tenn.)	Gubser	O'Brien, Ill.
Bates	Hagen	O'Brien, N. Y.
Becker	Hale	O'Hara, Ill.
Beckworth	Halleck	O'Neill
Bennett, Fla.	Hardy	Osmers
Bennett, Mich.	Harris	Ostertag
Blatnik	Harrison, Va.	Passman
Bltch	Haskell	Patman
Boggs	Hays, Ark.	Paterson
Boland	Healey	Pelly
Bolling	Hebert	Perkins
Bonner	Heseltun	Pfost
Boykin	Hess	Philbin
Boyle	Hill	Pilcher
Bray	Hillings	Poage
Breeding	Hollifield	Porter
Brooks, La.	Holland	Powell
Brooks, Tex.	Holmes	Preston
Broomfield	Holt	Price
Brown, Ga.	Holtzman	Quie
Brown, Mo.	Hosmer	Rabaut
Burdick	Huddleston	Reece, Tenn.
Burleson	Hull	Rhodes, Ariz.
Byrne, Pa.	Hyde	Rhodes, Pa.
Canfield	Ikard	Riehlman
Carnahan	Jarman	Riley
Celler	Jennings	Roberts
Chamberlain	Johnson	Robson, Ky.
Chelf	Jones, Ala.	Rodino
Chenoweth	Judd	Rogers, Colo.
Christopher	Karsten	Rogers, Fla.
Clark	Keating	Rogers, Mass.
Coffin	Kee	Rogers, Tex.
Cooley	Kelly	Rooney
Corbett	Keogh	Roosevelt
Cunningham,	Kilday	Sadlak
Iowa	Kilgore	Santangelo
Dawson, Ill.	Kling	St. George
Delaney	Kitchin	Saund
Dellay	Kluczynski	Saylor
Dent	Knutson	Scott, N. C.
Denton	Lane	Scudder
Derounian	Lankford	Seely-Brown
Devereux	LeCompte	Selden
Dingell	Lesinski	Sheppard
Dixon	Libonati	Shuford
Dollinger	Lipscomb	Sieminski
Donohue	Long	Slkes
Dorn, N. Y.	McCarthy	Sisk
Dorn, S. C.	McCormack	Smith, Calif.
Dwyer	McDonough	Smith, Miss.
Eberharter	McFall	Spence
Edmondson	McGovern	Staggers
Elliott	McIntire	Steed
Engle	Machrowicz	Sullivan
Evlins	Mack, Ill.	Teague, Calif.
Fallon	Madden	Teller
Farbsteln	Mahon	Tewes
Fascell	Mailliard	Thomas
Felghan	Martin	Thompson, N. J.
Fisher	May	Thompson, Tex.
Flood	Marrow	Thomson, Wyo.
Forand	Metcalfe	Thornberry
Ford	Michel	Tollefson
Forrester	Miller, Calif.	Trimble

Udall
Ullman
Utt
Vanlk
Van Zandt
Vinson
Wainwright

Walter
Westland
Widnall
Wler
Willis
Wilson, Calif.
Withrow

Wolverton
Wright
Yates
Young
Younger
Zablocki
Zelenko

NAYS—139

Abbitt	Dowdy	Meader
Abernethy	Everett	Miller, Nebr.
Adair	Fenton	Minshall
Alexander	Fino	Mumma
Alger	Flynt	Neal
Allen, Ill.	Fountain	Norblad
Andersen,	George	Norrell
H. Carl	Gray	O'Hara Minn.
Andrews	Griffin	O'Konski
Ashmore	Gross	Pillion
Auchincloss	Haley	Poff
Avery	Harden	Polk
Bass, N. H.	Harrison, Nebr.	Prouty
Baumhart	Harvey	Ray
Beamer	Hemphill	Reed
Belcher	Henderson	Rees, Kans.
Bentley	Herlong	Reuss
Berry	Hiestand	Robeson, Va.
Betts	Hoeven	Robison, N. Y.
Bolton	Hoffman	Rutherford
Bosch	Jackson	Schenck
Brown, Ohio	James	Scherer
Brownson	Jenkins	Schwengel
Broyhill	Jensen	Scott, Pa.
Budge	Johansen	Sclvner
Byrne, Ill.	Jones, Mo.	Sheehan
Byrnes, Wis.	Kean	Siler
Cannon	Kearns	Simpson, Ill.
Carrigg	Kilburn	Smith, Kans.
Cederberg	Knox	Smith, Va.
Chlperfield	Krueger	Springer
Church	Lafore	Stauffer
Clevenger	Laird	Taber
Coad	Landrum	Talle
Collier	Latham	Taylor
Colmer	Lennon	Tuck
Coudert	Loser	Van Pelt
Cramer	McCulloch	Vursell
Cretella	McGregor	Watts
Curtin	McMillan	Weaver
Curtis, Mass.	McVey	Wharton
Curtis, Mo.	Macdonald	Whitener
Dague	Mack, Wash.	Whitten
Davis, Ga.	Marshall	Williams, Miss.
Dawson, Utah	Mason	Wilson, Ind.
Dennison	Matthews	Winstead

NOT VOTING—35

Ayres	Durham	Moulder
Barden	Fogarty	Murray
Bow	Gordon	Radwan
Buckley	Grant	Rains
Byrd	Gwinn	Rivers
Cunningham,	Hays, Ohio	Shelley
Nebr.	Horan	Simpson, Pa.
Davis, Tenn.	Kearney	Teague, Tex.
Dies	Kirwan	Thompson, La.
Diggs	McIntosh	Vorys
Dooley	Magnuson	Wigglesworth
Doyle	Morrison	Williams, N. Y.

So, two-thirds not having voted in favor thereof, the motion was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Rains with Mr. Wigglesworth.
Mr. Dies with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Davis of Tennessee with Mr. McIntosh.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Radwan.

Mr. Morrison with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Ayres.

Mr. Hays of Ohio with Mr. Kearney.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Horan.

Mr. Byrd with Mr. Dooley.
Mr. Fogarty with Mr. Bow.

Mr. Grant with Mr. Vorys.
Mr. Shelley with Mr. Williams of New York.

Mr. Doyle with Mr. Cunningham of Nebraska.

Messrs. NORRELL, BYRNES of Wisconsin, and ALGER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. PASSMAN and BOLAND changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

CORRECTION OF VOTE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the gentleman from New York [Mr. GWINN] I ask unanimous consent to correct the RECORD on rollcall No. 23. I have been advised by his office and other sources that he was not here that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

BENEFITS TO WIDOWS OF EMPLOYEES OF LIGHTHOUSE SERVICE

Mr. BONNER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (S. 235) to increase from \$50 to \$75 per month the amount of benefits payable to widows of certain former employees of the Lighthouse Service.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the first section and section 2 of the act entitled "An act to provide benefits for widows of certain persons who were retired or are eligible for retirement under section 6 of the act entitled 'An act to authorize aids to navigation and for other works in the Lighthouse Service, and for other purposes,' approved June 20, 1918, as amended," approved August 19, 1950 (83 U. S. C. 771 and 772) are each amended by striking out "\$50 per month" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$75 per month."

Sec. 2. The amendments made by this act shall take effect on the first day of the first month which begins after the date of the enactment of this act.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

The question is on suspending the rules and passing the bill.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

(Mrs. SULLIVAN, at the request of Mr. BONNER, was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mrs. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of S. 235 and urge its passage.

Through the years that civilians have manned the light stations, the wife of the lightkeeper has been an indispensable part of the Lighthouse Service, and she received no pay for the work it was necessary for her to perform. Witnesses have testified that a prerequisite to appointment as a civilian lightkeeper, at stations affording living quarters, was a wife who could share the responsibilities of the light station, and who could perform the duties of its operation along with her husband. Employment as a lightkeeper usually meant living in an isolated place, and dwelling space provided for the keepers and their families afforded few, if any, conveniences. Periods of bad weather meant 24-hour duty, during which the wife of the keeper took her turn to make possible the round-the-clock maintenance of the station. At the larger stations, where 2 or perhaps 3 keepers were in attendance, the wife of each keeper had her regular duty hours. The contribution made by the keepers' wives was that without which there would not have been a Lighthouse Service, and there is little doubt that wives of the keepers lived an ardu-

ous existence, performing duties that often assumed heroic proportions.

HEARING ON S. 235, 85TH CONGRESS, MAY 1, 1957

As of the time of this hearing, held on May 1, 1957, there were a small group of 415 widows and the cost per fiscal year at that time was \$249,000. The additional cost per year for the \$25 per month increase would be \$124,500 per year, subject, of course, to the death of these pensioners, since on the whole they are an aged group.

As of the date of March 1, 1958, there were 408 of these widows on the pension roll. This would decrease the pension roll at the present \$50 per month by \$4,200, and would subtract \$2,100 from the figure of \$124,500 which was set out at the 1957 hearing. There is no possibility of an increase in the number of people who would be affected by this proposed \$25 per month increase. Rather, due to mortality, there will be a decided decrease as the years pass.

Had these pensioners been under civil service during the interval of time that they had been drawing \$50 per month, they would have been entitled to an increase of 12 percent, based on the amount of pension at that time. Therefore, had they been under civil service, they would have in all probability been drawing approximately \$68 per month over that interval of time.

The subcommittee, as well as the full Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries, agreed this bill should pass on its merits.

(Mr. GARMATZ, at the request of Mr. BONNER, was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

[Mr. GARMATZ' remarks will appear hereafter in the Appendix.]

TWO HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTH OF ALEXANDER HAMILTON

Mr. FORRESTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the resolution (H. J. Res. 483) to amend the act of August 30, 1954, establishing a commission for the celebration of the 200th anniversary of the birth of Alexander Hamilton, with a Senate amendment thereto, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 10, strike out "March 15, 1958" and insert "April 30, 1958."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, and I hope I shall not have to object, but is this going to cost any money?

Mr. FORRESTER. Not one penny.

Mr. GROSS. I withdraw my reservation of objection, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SOIL BANK ACT

Mr. McMILLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 10843) to amend section 114 of the Soil Bank Act with respect to compliance with corn acreage allotments, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments, and agree to the conference asked by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Carolina? The Chair hears none, and appoints the following conferees: Messrs. COOLEY, POAGE, GATHINGS, HILL, and HOEVEN.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tonight to file a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I again ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules may have until midnight tomorrow night to file certain privileged reports.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL FREEDOM SHRINE FOUNDATION

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 459 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 8290) to authorize the erection of a national monument symbolizing the ideals of democracy in the fulfillment of the act of August 31, 1954 (68 Stat. 1029), "An act to create a National Monument Commission, and for other purposes." After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. Speaker, I have no requests for time on the rule.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, this is a rule making in order the bill

3. PURCHASING. The Appropriations Committee reported without amendment H. J. Res. 588, to provide immediate appropriations to Government civilian agencies of up to 50% of the amounts set forth in the Budget for the fiscal year 1959 for the objects "Supplies and Materials" and "Equipment" in order to accelerate planned procurement programs (H. Rept. 1583). p. 5088
4. FORESTRY. Passed without amendment, 218 to 102, S. 3262, to authorize Federal grants to construct Olympic facilities for the 1960 winter games on Forest Service land. Rejected several amendments dealing with the role of the Armed Services in handling the games. This bill will now be sent to the President. pp. 5058-9, 5071-81
5. IMPORTS. Passed without amendment H. R. 11407, to extend for two years the law allowing free importation of personal and household goods brought into the U. S. under Government orders. pp. 5052-3
Passed without amendment H. R. 10112, to make permanent the existing privileges of free importation of guar seed. p. 5053
6. FLOOD CONTROL. Granted the House Conferees on S. 497, the Flood-Control Act of 1958, until midnight, Mar. 28, to file their report. Reps. McGregor, Martin and Fallon discussed the speed with which the committee acted. (p. 5057). The Daily Digest reported: "Conferees, in executive session, agreed to file a conference report on the differences between the Senate and House-passed versions of S. 497, Flood Control Act of 1958." (p. D274).
7. ROADS. Disagreed with the Senate amendment to H. R. 9821, the road authorization bill, and appointed conferees. Senate conferees were appointed Mar. 27. p. 5056
Rep. Curtis, Mass., criticized the increase in the Federal share of matched grants from 50 to 70% of the cost for the \$400 million additional for ABC roads. He stated that such "farm-to-market" roads as might be helped were of "predominantly local interest." p. 5082
8. RECIPROCAL TRADE. Reps. Bailey Hoffman, Kearns, Neal, Bennett (Mich.), and Dorn discussed various aspects of the foreign trade programs and policies of the U. S. pp. 5056, 5083-5.
9. COMMITTEE ASSIGNMENTS. Rep. Westland was elected a member of the Government Operations Committee. p. 5082
10. SOIL BANK. Received from this Department a report on the conservation reserve program of the Soil Bank for 1957. p. 5087
11. INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS. Received from the State Department the sixth report on the extent and disposition of U. S. contributions to international organizations for fiscal year 1957 (H. Doc. 360). p. 5087
12. RECLAMATION. Received a Mass. Legislature memorial urging Congress and the President to enact legislation expanding the use of artificial irrigation. p. 5089
13. LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM. Rep. Albert announced that on Mon., Mar. 31, the House would consider H. J. Res. 588, to accelerate expenditures for planned procurement programs through advance purchases by Government agencies against eventual 1959 appropriations, to be followed by consideration of H. R. 10589, the general Government matters appropriation bill for 1959, and S. 1740, to authorize payment from the Employees' Life Insurance Fund of expenses incurred by the CSC in assuming and maintaining the assets and liabilities of certain

Digest of CONGRESSIONAL PROCEEDINGS

OF INTEREST TO THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

OFFICE OF BUDGET AND FINANCE
(For Department Staff Only)

Issued March 31, 1958
For actions of March 28, 1958
85th-2d, No. 51

CONTENTS

Adjournment.....	14		
Agricultural appro- priations.....	1		
Appropriations....	1,2,3,13		
Beneficial associations.	13		
Committee assignments....	9		
Farm program.....	17	Imports.....	5
Flood control.....	6	Information.....	18
Food storage.....	23	International organi- zations.....	11
Foreign trade.....	21	Irrigation.....	16
Forestry.....	4	Labor standards.....	19
Grains.....	22	Legislative program.....	13
Guar seed.....	5	Personnel.....	20
Household goods.....	5	Purchasing.....	3,13
		Reciprocal trade.....	8
		Reclamation.....	12
		Reorganization.....	24
		Roads.....	7
		Soil bank.....	10

HIGHLIGHTS: House committee reported agricultural appropriation bill.

HOUSE

1. AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959. The Appropriations Committee reported without amendment this bill, H. R. 11767 (H. Rept. 1584). p. 5088
Representatives of the Department agencies have been advised in detail of the Committee's actions on the estimates for the Department. Copies of the bill and committee report will be distributed directly to the agency budget offices, as soon as received, pursuant to a distribution list that has been worked out with the Department agencies. The agencies will receive the material at the same time this office will receive it. The material will not be distributed from this office. In general, copies should be obtained from the agency budget offices rather than from this office.
At the end of this Digest are a summary comparison of the Committee actions with the 1959 estimates and with anticipated funds available in 1958, and excerpts from the committee report.
2. GENERAL GOVERNMENT MATTERS APPROPRIATION BILL, 1959. The Appropriations Committee submitted a supplemental report on this bill, H. R. 10589 (H. Rept. 1332, Part 2). p. 5087

Mr. ROGERS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity to express my views relative to the proposed reduction in our National Guard to 360,000 men—40,000 less than its current authorized strength—as called for in the President's budget recently submitted to the Congress.

The National Guard provides the United States with an ever-present force ready to defend the home front. American history and tradition are built on the fact that our Nation depends on the citizen soldier for defense. There are sound reasons for this practice. Since the National Guard is composed entirely of volunteers who perform their assigned duties solely out of patriotism, the spirit of National Guard units is high.

From the beginning of our Nation, leaders in Government and military have recognized that cuts in the Regular services must be counterbalanced by increases in the Reserve forces. With small Regular forces, only by having strong, well-trained Reserves can we maintain the military power necessary to assure that we will be safe from attack. And in the long history of the United States, the National Guard has proved again and again that it can best, in time of peril, supplement the Regular forces with units ready to move and to fight.

I have received many letters and telegrams from my district and other parts of Florida, protesting any cut in the National Guard. The Palm Beach Post Times had this to say:

As they did at the start of World War II, our National Guard men have more than once proved to be the line backers that made America a formidable military power despite its chronic state of unpreparedness for war. These citizen-soldiers are the minutemen of modern times.

Perhaps the coming of the space age has made them obsolete? Perhaps. We will venture to doubt it, and submit that the burden of proof is on those who now propose to thin their ranks.

If, as we have been repeatedly told, the next war will be fought on our own land, would it not be wiser to strengthen, rather than weaken our home guard?

Considered solely from the viewpoint of national defense and from the fact that our Nation today faces peril from every side, it would be most unwise and surely foolhardy to cut the strength of the guard, and I want to add my protest to others in expressing my opposition to this proposal.

THE RIVERS AND HARBORS BEACH EROSION AND FLOOD-CONTROL PROJECTS

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the conferees on the bill S. 497, the River and Harbor and Flood-Control Act of 1958, may have until midnight tonight to file their report.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I recognize that the conferees do not meet until this afternoon on this bill representing hundreds of millions of dollars and covering projects in many sections of our country. I note that the request of the gentleman

from Maryland is that they may have until midnight to file their report.

I wish to include in the request the right to file minority views. The question that comes to my mind is whether or not the conferees on this bill, running to over a billion dollars, will have adequate time and that interested Members and citizens can be heard. Certainly this should be done so that we can make a definite decision and still protect the people interested in this bill. We should not rush this bill through and not give all an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MCGREGOR. I yield to the distinguished minority leader.

Mr. MARTIN. This is the bill, is it not, in which there was such a radical departure made between the percentage to be borne by the Federal Government and the States?

Mr. MCGREGOR. In some instances local participation is changed and new projects added. That is correct. I know the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. FALLON], will help in every way he can to see that we are given adequate time to be heard; but I realize that they have majority votes and can really steam roller these projects, but I sincerely hope the majority will realize the right of all.

Mr. FALLON. This request, of course, gives the right to file; it does not say that you have to file.

Mr. MCGREGOR. The right to file a report?

Mr. FALLON. That we may have until midnight tonight to file a report.

Mr. MCGREGOR. I understand and appreciate the minority being given the same privilege; but is the interest of the general public protected? Let us hope so.

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

MARIA SANFORD

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 64

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the statue of Maria Sanford, presented by the State of Minnesota, to be placed in the Statuary Hall collection, is accepted in the name of the United States, and that the thanks of the Congress be tendered said State for the contribution of the statue of one of its most eminent citizens, illustrious for her leadership in education; and be it further

Resolved, That a copy of these resolutions, suitably engrossed and duly authenticated, be transmitted to the Governor of Minnesota.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Will the gentleman in charge of the resolution explain it?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. I shall be pleased to.

There are two resolutions sent over from the Senate, both concurrent resolutions. They merely carry out what has been the policy and custom of the Congress with reference to statues in the Capitol. This has reference to the statue of Maria Sanford. The Legislature of Minnesota has designated that this be 1 of 2 statues which that State can place in Statuary Hall. This first resolution is merely that it be accepted in the name of the United States.

There is no controversy, and it was reported out of our committee unanimously.

Mr. LECOMPTE. As a matter of fact the gentleman has four resolutions, does he not?

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Yes, there are four resolutions.

Mr. LECOMPTE. And they were all reported out unanimously and are without expense to the Government.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. They were all reported out unanimously and none of them will cost any money.

Mr. LECOMPTE. Actually, two of them are Senate resolutions which have already passed the other body.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. There are three Senate resolutions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was concurred in.

STATUE OF THE LATE MARIA SANFORD, OF MINNESOTA

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I send to the Clerk's desk Senate Concurrent Resolution 65 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the Senate concurrent resolution, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Minnesota Statehood Centennial Commission of the State of Minnesota is hereby authorized to place temporarily in the rotunda of the Capitol a statue of the late Maria Sanford, of Minnesota, and to hold ceremonies in the rotunda on said occasion; and the Architect of the Capitol is hereby authorized to make the necessary arrangements therefor.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATIONAL RAILROAD MUSEUM, GREEN BAY, WIS.

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk House Concurrent Resolution 233 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the House concurrent resolution, as follows:

Whereas the American railroad has been of incalculable importance to the growth and development of our Nation in time of peace and a major factor in her defense in time of war; and

Whereas there has been established at Green Bay, Wis., the National Railroad Museum whose purpose is to afford recognition in perpetuity to the role of the American railroad in our Nation's early history by preserving the railroad rolling stock and other memorabilia of the age of steam; and

Whereas the city of Green Bay has donated a site for the buildings and exhibits to be erected as part of the National Railroad Museum, and the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, an official State agency, has undertaken the responsibility of developing and operating the National Railroad Museum; and

Whereas there has been donated or pledged to the National Railroad Museum early and rare steam locomotives, other rolling stock, printed material, photographs, broadsides and ephemera, including the Carl R. Gray, Jr., collection, thus insuring its place as a center for the preservation of significant physical evidence of American railroading's early history; and

Whereas the National Railroad Museum, as an educational institution of major significance to all Americans in its portrayal of the development of the American railroad and the lives of the inventors, managers, investors and workers who created the ties of steel that bind our country together, is of national interest: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress hereby recognizes the National Railroad Museum as a memorial to the individuals who built and ran our early American railroads and as a fitting and valuable institution for the collection and preservation of the memorabilia of the age of steam locomotion.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 2, line 6, after the word "locomotion" insert "And be it further resolved, That the United States shall be put to no expense by the approval of this concurrent resolution."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The House concurrent resolution was agreed to and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ONE HUNDRED AND FIRST AIRBORNE DIVISION ASSOCIATION

Mr. JONES of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on House Administration I send to the Clerk's desk House Joint Resolution 451 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the House joint resolution, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to grant authority to the 101st Airborne Division Association to erect a memorial on public grounds in the District of Columbia in honor and in commemoration of the men of the 101st Airborne Division, United States Army, who have given their lives to their country.

SEC. 2. The design and site of such memorial shall be approved by the National Capital Planning Commission, the Secretary of the Interior, and the National Commission of Fine Arts. The United States shall be put to no expense in the erection of such memorial.

SEC. 3. The authority conferred pursuant to this joint resolution shall lapse unless (1) the erection of such memorial is commenced within 5 years from the date of enactment of this joint resolution, and (2) before its commencement funds are certified available in an amount sufficient, in the judgment of the Secretary of the Interior, to insure completion of the memorial.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, after "Columbia" insert "or environs."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The House joint resolution was agreed to, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

FLYING FORTRESS BOMBER OWNED BY THE GOVERNMENT OF ISRAEL

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago, I called the attention of the Members of the House to a newspaper article which stated that a flying fortress bomber, allegedly owned by the Government of Israel, destined for Venezuela and loaded with arms, had made a forced landing in Algeria.

I asked the State Department by letter to tell me how and when the Government of Israel acquired this flying fortress and who provided the cargo of arms. I received a letter from the State Department saying in effect, "We do not know."

I have written to the Defense Department and I hope that within 2 or 3 weeks or perhaps a month, I will be able to find out from the Defense Department something about this apparent mystery.

ACTIVITIES BY ARMED FORCES IN OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 516 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3262) to authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes. After general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Armed Services, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the consideration of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend.

(Mr. O'NEILL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, at the conclusion of my remarks I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. ALLEN].

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 516 makes in order the consideration of S. 3262, a bill authorizing certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games. The resolution provides for an open rule and 1 hour of general debate.

Section I of the bill will permit approximately 160 Army personnel, and a smaller number of Navy personnel to go, with equipment, to Squaw Valley, Calif., the site of the 1960 Winter Olympic Games for a period of approximately 60 days. They will assist the organizing committee in preparing the necessary courses, fields, rinks, and setting up avalanche control. The Department of Defense will loan vehicles designed to operate in heavy snow and also communication equipment and housekeeping supplies. Five hundred thousand dollars is authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section.

Section II of the bill authorizes the Secretary of Defense to advance to the organizing committee \$3,500,000 for the construction of a sports arena. This will be built on land owned by the United States which has been leased to the State of California. California will operate the area as a State park, and the arena, which becomes the property of the United States, will be available in the future for sports events. The construction of the arena will be performed by private contractors and no military personnel will be used.

It should be noted that California in expending its own appropriation of \$7,990,000 is erecting substantial improvements on Federal land other than that on which the sports arena will be located. For example, the Olympic Village costing \$1,100,000 will be erected on forest service land and will represent a permanent improvement thereon. The sewage disposal plant is on Federal property and its estimate of cost is approximately \$500,000.

Naturally, all of these funds are not directed specifically to the VIII Olympic Winter Games, but a substantial portion of the expenditure will be so directed.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. It is my understanding that official invitations have gone out to the various countries involved. Is that the gentleman's understanding?

Mr. O'NEILL. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'NEILL. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Does the gentleman know whether any public law was enacted by which the invitations were extended and stating that Congress would be asked to appropriate \$4 million for this purpose?

Mr. O'NEILL. I believe there was a House resolution, not a public law. A House resolution was adopted by this Congress providing that the Olympic games may be held in this country in 1960.

Mr. GROSS. But no indications that the House was going to be called upon to

provide \$4 million, or any other amount, for this purpose.

Mr. O'NEILL. Well, I believe that anybody that voted for that resolution should have known that the Federal Government would be expected to participate.

Mr. GROSS. We have had similar resolutions before the House dealing with other Olympic games, and I do not recall at any time this House having made an appropriation? Does the gentleman from Massachusetts know of any?

Mr. O'NEILL. I would have no knowledge of that.

Mr. ALLEN of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REINVESTMENT BY AIR CARRIERS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill, H. R. 5822, to amend section 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 with respect to the reinvestment by air carriers of the proceeds from the sale or other disposition of certain operating property and equipment and ask unanimous consent that the statement of the managers on the part of the House be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of March 25, 1958.)

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes.

H. R. 5822 amends the Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938, to provide that in determining the need of air carriers for subsidy mail pay, the Civil Aeronautics Board shall not take into account gains derived from the sale or other disposition of flight equipment, if the net gains are reinvested in flight equipment. The bill was passed by the House on August 14, 1957, and by the Senate, with amendments on February 20, 1958. One Senate amendment would make the bill cover losses as well as gains. Another fixes an effective date. A third tightens up the reinvestment provision.

The purpose of this legislation is to help the smaller airlines to buy new and more economical aircraft by permitting them to invest capital gains from the sale of old equipment in other flight equipment. Due to inflation, used aircraft prices have gone up in recent years, so that carriers have been making profits when they sell used equipment. They want to be allowed to invest these profits in new and improved equipment.

The bill has nothing whatever to do with taxes. If the bill becomes law, airlines would continue to pay the so-called capital-gains tax.

Under the present law, as interpreted by the Civil Aeronautics Board, if a subsidized airline makes a capital gain on

the sale of flight equipment that gain is deducted from the airline's subsidy payment. The subsidized airlines need this money badly to make downpayments on new equipment. Deprived of these gains, the airlines have to go out and raise new capital, which is hard to do these days.

Gains from the sale of flight equipment are exempt from confiscation under H. R. 5822 only if reinvested in flight equipment. These gains cannot be used for any other purpose whatsoever.

If the subsidized airlines are going to get off subsidy—and this is especially true of the smaller local service or so-called feeder airlines—they must have modern equipment to cut operating expenses and hold their own in the competitive race. They cannot do it with outdated equipment.

This bill is an absolute must to help the local service carriers solve their re-equipment problems.

The situation has become even more urgent since the House acted last summer, because the affected air carriers now find the equipment they need to buy off the drawing boards and on the assembly line. The F-27, the local service carrier DC-3 replacement airplane will be ready for delivery to the first local service carrier in April or May. The commercial version of the Boeing 707 is now flying, undergoing its final tests for certification and delivery later this year. The carriers with these aircraft on order say that arrangements must be completed now for acquisition of these airplanes. Those carriers who have not yet placed firm orders for replacement aircraft feel they must do so promptly.

The Senate adopted three amendments to H. R. 5822. The principal amendment writes in an effective date.

NEED FOR EFFECTIVE DATE

H. R. 5822 as introduced contained a section making the effective date January 1, 1956. This was stricken out by a committee amendment so that, as passed by the House, the bill had no effective date, presumably making the legislation effective on the date of enactment.

But this is a very technical matter involving the very complicated rate-making processes of the board, and that interpretation might be challenged.

After the bill had passed the House, serious questions were raised regarding the effective date of the legislation.

On August 30, 1957, Vice Chairman Gurney of the Civil Aeronautics Board addressed a letter to me in which he said:

Unless the bill is clarified as to the date subsequent to which capital gains cannot be offset, it might be argued that the prohibition extends not only as to all future gains but also past gains involved in rates that are now open, which would include among others, Pan American rates all the way back to 1946.

Subsequently, Chairman Durfee wrote me in more detail regarding the Board's view that it would be helpful to have a definite effective date included in the legislation. In his letter he stated:

H. R. 5822, as passed by the House, contains no express provision as to its effective date,

the provision of section 2 making the amendment applicable to gains realized on and after January 1, 1956, having been deleted. As you are aware, there are a number of carriers whose subsidy rates are still to be determined for periods extending as far back as 1946. It is the Board's opinion that failure of the bill to specifically state whether or not it is applicable to these pending cases raises a legal question involving possibly substantial sums of money which might not be resolved short of litigation in the courts.

LETTERS FROM BOARD

The two letters from the Civil Aeronautics Board regarding the importance of writing an effective date into the bill follow:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, August 30, 1957.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate
and Foreign Commerce, House of
Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARRIS: While, for the reasons stated in Chairman Durfee's testimony before the Subcommittee on Transportation and Communications on July 18, 1957, relative to H. R. 5822, the Board is taking no position in regard to the capital-gains legislation, there is one aspect of the legislation now under consideration which Mr. Cunningham of your staff suggested that I call to your attention.

The bill H. R. 5822 as introduced in the House provided in section 2 that the amendment to section 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act should be effective as to capital gains realized on and after January 1, 1956. As passed by the House, section 2 was entirely deleted. Thus, there is no express provision as to the effective date of section 406 (b) as amended. Unless the bill is clarified as to the date subsequent to which capital gains cannot be offset, it might be argued that the prohibition extends not only as to all future gains but also past gains involved in rates that are now open, which would include, among others, Pan American rates all the way back to 1946. Even if section 2 is restored, it must be recognized that rate cases which are now pending, including Pan American's, which was opened in October 1956, would benefit for the period on and after January 1, 1956.

The Board is not suggesting any particular method or date but is pointing out only the problem that arises by lack of any specific cutoff provision in the bill as passed by the House. As the legislative history seems to suggest, if the intent of the House in deleting section 2 was to eliminate all retroactivity and make the amendment effective from the date of passage, then an express provision in the bill to that effect would be desirable to avoid what might prove to be a costly ambiguity.

As it is my understanding that you may wish to distribute copies of this letter to other members of the committee, I am enclosing a number of extra copies.

Sincerely yours,

CHAN GURNEY,
Vice Chairman.

CIVIL AERONAUTICS BOARD,
Washington, October 9, 1957.

Hon. OREN HARRIS,
Chairman, Committee on Interstate
and Foreign Commerce,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HARRIS: This is in further reply to your letter of September 3, 1957, requesting additional comments on the question of the application of the capital gains bill (H. R. 5822) to gains realized prior to the date of enactment of the bill.

As noted in the vice chairman's letter of August 30, 1957, H. R. 5822, as passed by the House, contains no express provision as to

its effective date, the provision of section 2 making the amendment applicable to gains realized on and after January 1, 1956, having been deleted. As you are aware, there are a number of carriers whose subsidy rates are still to be determined for periods extending as far back as 1946. It is the Board's opinion that failure of the bill to specifically state whether or not it is applicable to these pending cases raises a legal question involving possibly substantial sums of money which might not be resolved short of litigation in the courts.

It is of course true that statutes are generally construed as being operative only as to future transactions, in the absence of a clear expression to the contrary (*Brewster v. Gage* (280 U. S. 327, 337)). This presumption is applied most rigidly in cases where the legislation would adversely affect vested rights, create new liabilities in connection with past transactions, or impair obligations existing under contracts (*Lewellyn v. Frick* (268 U. S. 238, 251-2); *People v. Dillard* (298 N. Y. Supp. 296, 302, 252 App. Div. 125)). On the other hand, where legislation would not have such prejudicial results, as for example in the case of remedial and curative statutes, the presumption against retroactivity is frequently not applied (*Levy v. Birnschein* (206 Wis. 486, 240 N. W. 140, 141); *Crawford, Statutory Construction* ((1940) 566, 575-80)). Since the capital gains legislation does not adversely affect the rights of carriers or other private parties, and, indeed, beneficially affects such rights, the argument is available that the presumption against retroactivity is not applicable, and that full retroactive effect should be given to the intention of Congress to relieve the carriers of the "other revenue" provision of section 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act as regards capital gains.

It should be noted that the language of H. R. 5822, is not necessarily inconsistent with the view that the amendment operates retroactively. The bill does not merely purport to change a rule of ratemaking, but affirmatively directs that in determining air carrier need, "the Board shall not take into account" certain capital gains. Read literally, and without the aid of any presumption against retroactivity, this language might well be construed as depriving the Board of any power over capital gains in all cases decided after the enactment of the legislation, when the conditions set forth in the statute are complied with, irrespective of whether those gains were realized before or after such enactment.

Brief mention should also be made of the statutory antiretroactivity provision contained in title 1, United States Code Annotated, section 109, which provides, in part, that "the repeal of any statute shall not have the effect to release or extinguish any penalty, forfeiture, or liability incurred under such statute, unless the repealing act shall so expressly provide." The effect of this provision as regards H. R. 5822 is not clear. To begin with, the provision relates only to the "repeal" of a statute, and while one court has expressly held that an amendment constitutes a repeal for the purposes of section 109 (*Moorehead v. Hunter* (198 F. 2d 52)), there is no certainty that another court might not reach a different conclusion. Moreover, the question would arise as to whether the "other revenue" rule laid down in section 406 (b) of the Civil Aeronautics Act imposes a liability within the meaning of section 109 and whether, in any event, such liability could be considered as "incurred under" section 406 (b) prior to a board decision offsetting capital gains against the carrier's need.

There are of course substantial arguments which can be made on the other side of the issue, and the Board would not attempt to predict the ultimate outcome of litigation.

However, in view of what would appear to be substantial ambiguity on the face of the bill as passed by the House, the Board felt that it was desirable to bring this matter to your attention.

Sincerely yours,

JAMES R. DURFEE,
Chairman.

The Senate adopted an amendment to make the legislation effective April 6, 1956. It was accepted by the conference as meeting the objections raised by the Board.

There is a good reason for making the legislation effective April 6, 1956: On that date, the CAB reopened the mail rates of all subsidized carriers to determine whether or not the Board is required by law to deduct capital gains from the sale of property from subsidy payments.

On March 7, 1958, the Board decided that it is required by law to offset capital gains on sales of aircraft against subsidies. That decision is retroactive to April 6, 1956.

Failure to make this legislation effective April 6, 1956, would leave a period during which capital gains would be recaptured, notwithstanding the fact that this would be contrary to Board policy prior to that date and contrary to congressional policy expressed in this bill.

In other words, if this policy of permitting the subsidized carriers to retain their capital gains from the sale of flight equipment is good policy now, or on the day this legislation is approved, it is sound policy as of April 6, 1956.

Furthermore, certain carriers would be adversely and unfairly affected if one policy is followed from April 6, 1956, to the date of enactment of this legislation, and then we go back to the old policy in effect before April 6, 1956.

AMOUNT OF GAINS

So far as can be determined from figures obtained from the carriers and records of the Civil Aeronautics Board, the following carriers had capital gains between April 6, 1956, and January 1, 1958, which would be affected by the retroactive date of this legislation:

Alaska Airlines.....	\$83,000
Alaska Coastal.....	6,102
Allegheny.....	169,000
Chicago Helicopter Airways.....	21,797
Continental (capital gains realized Apr. 6-26, 1956; off subsidy since then).....	150,630
Pacific Northern.....	10,000
Pan American (capital gains realized Apr. 6-Oct. 1, 1956; on temporary service rate since then)....	125,000
Panagra.....	711,429

Pan American had capital gains in excess of \$125,000 during that period. Whether or not the other gains would be affected by making this bill retroactive is not certain, depending on the outcome of a proceeding now pending in the Civil Aeronautics Board. On October 1, 1956, the Board placed Pan American on a temporary service or non-subsidy rate.

For example, a few days after Pan American went off subsidy, the carrier lost a plane in the Pacific. This accident resulted in a capital gain from insurance of \$966,500. But if Pan American in fact went off subsidy on October 1, 1956, it would be allowed to keep that

capital gain and do whatever it wanted to do with the money.

Pan American received \$3,305,000 from the sale of six aircraft prior to April 6, 1956, when it was on a closed mail pay rate. It was allowed to keep that.

Failure to make this legislation retroactive to April 6, 1956, would penalize Alaska Coastal, Allegheny, Continental, and the other carriers listed above.

Allegheny is a very good example. Without a retroactive clause, Allegheny would be penalized \$169,000, by the mere transfer of two planes although they made no profit, except on paper. To get a faster, bigger plane Allegheny traded two DC-3's and 12,000 shares of stock worth \$4 a share. Without this legislation, that paper gain comes out of their subsidy.

Continental sold three planes. One was delivered on April 5, 1956. Continental can keep the capital gain realized on that plane. But the capital gain realized on the two planes delivered on April 6, 1956, is subject to recapture by the Board. Continental has been off subsidy since April 26, 1956.

The Senate added another amendment that strengthens the bill. This provides that to take advantage of this legislation, the carrier cannot include investments in equipment delivered prior to April 6, 1956.

The House conferees proposed substitute language to clarify the Senate amendment to include losses as well as gains. The Senate conferees accepted the House proposal.

ACTION OF BOARD

During consideration of H. R. 5822 in the House, it was pointed out that the Civil Aeronautics Board had the subject under consideration in the so-called capital-gains proceedings. The issue in that proceedings was what treatment the Board should accord to gains on retirement of air-carrier property under the terms of the Civil Aeronautics Act.

At that time it was suggested that consideration of H. R. 5822 was premature and that we should wait for the Board to decide its capital-gains proceedings.

The Board now has decided that issue. On March 7, a majority of the Board concluded that the Board is required by law to offset against subsidies the profits which subsidized airlines make on the sale of aircraft.

At the same time, three members of the Board, without expressing opinions on the merits of individual provisions of the pending legislation, indicated they had no objection to the legislation's basic objective.

Following is a statement issued by the Board regarding the decision in the capital-gains proceedings:

A majority of the Civil Aeronautics Board today concluded that it is required by law to offset against subsidies the profits which airlines may make on the sale of aircraft.

On this major issue in the CAB's capital-gains case, Chairman James R. Durfee and Members Harmar D. Denny and G. Joseph Minetti comprised the majority.

Vice Chairman Chan Gurney and Member Louis J. Hector were of the opinion that the Board does have the legal power to permit carriers on subsidy to retain capital gains arising from the sale of flight equip-

Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kluczynski
Knutson
Krueger
Lafore
Latham
Lennon
McDonough
Magnuson
Moore
Morgan
Morrison

Moulder
Passman
Radwan
Rains
Rivers
Robeson, Va.
Roosevelt
St. George
Schwengel
Scott, Pa.
Sieminski
Simpson, Pa.
Spence

Staggers
Steed
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Teller
Thompson, La.
Tollefson
Vorys
Wainwright
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Wright
Zelenko

So the conference report was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. Evins with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Morrison with Mr. Allen of California.
Mr. Willis with Mr. Moore.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Haskell.
Mr. Kline with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.
Mrs. Griffiths with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. James.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Byrd with Mrs. Bolton.
Mr. Boland with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mrs. St. George.
Mr. Abbutt with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Alexander with Mr. Derounian.
Mr. Dorn with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.
Mr. Lennon with Mr. McDonough.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Krueger.
Mr. Rains with Mr. Bosch.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Celler with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Wainwright.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Vorys.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. Healey with Mr. Dennison.
Mr. Dawson of Illinois with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Farbstain with Mr. Chipfield.
Mr. Teller with Mr. Schwengel.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Burdick.
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Ashley with Mr. Lafore.

Mr. COAD changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The doors were opened.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have permission to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report just agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

INTERNATIONAL CLAIMS SETTLEMENT ACT OF 1949

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Executive Communication No. 1736 be referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

ADDITIONAL VIEWS TO ACCOMPANY H. R. 2767

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may be permitted to file additional views to accompany the bill H. R. 2767, House Report No. 1461, in order that these additional views may serve the purpose of correcting some Printing Office errors in the original report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

IMMEDIATE TAX RELIEF FOR SMALL BUSINESS

(Mr. HILL asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD.)

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, the six Republican members of the Select Committee on Small Business are today introducing identical bills providing for rapid amortization of capital improvements by small business.

The bill is for a 3-year temporary period and is designed to promote expansion in small firms on a wide basis. I have been joined in this action by the gentleman from New York [Mr. RIEHLMAN], the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. SEELY-BROWN], the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McCULLOCH], the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. SHEEHAN], and the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. MOORE].

My colleagues and I feel strongly that if enacted this bill would provide an immediate stimulus to the economy. The bill is tailored to assist small business and would grant an accelerated depreciation on capital improvements in buildings and equipment up to \$50,000 expended during 1958, 1959, or 1960.

The schedule of rapid amortization would allow depreciation of 50 percent of the value of the addition in the first year and 25 percent for each of 2 succeeding years.

Continuing studies point out that profits of small firms are subject to more frequent and violent fluctuations than those of larger concerns. The present inability of small business to retain sufficient earnings to modernize and enlarge plants and capital structures is in part due to high taxes. This bill would enable the smaller firms to write off on an accelerated basis the cost of needed modernization and improvement.

We earnestly recommend that the Ways and Means Committee give early consideration to the tax problems of small business.

CORRECTION OF RECORD

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 27. On page 4993, beginning in line 8, change the third and fourth sentence to read as follows:

We are now in the unenviable position in the State of Oregon where unemployment has reached the very high rate of 12 to 13 per-

cent. In certain sections of the State, I am advised it is expected to reach the rate of 28 percent. This means that in those sections of the State 1 salary earner out of every 4 would be unemployed. The many unemployed and countless individuals who have exhausted their unemployment compensation benefits find little comfort in the words of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who look at the situation through rose-colored glasses and call it a healthy economy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

ACTIVITIES BY THE ARMED FORCES IN OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (S. 3262) to authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

CALL OF THE HOUSE

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 36]

Abbitt	Dies	Morrison
Alexander	Dorn, S. C.	Moulder
Allen, Calif.	Dwyer	Passman
Anfuso	Eberhart	Powell
Arends	Engle	Radwan
Ashley	Evins	Rains
Auchincloss	Farbstain	Reed
Barden	Fino	Reuss
Baring	Fogarty	Robeson, Va.
Barrett	Garmatz	Roosevelt
Bolton	Gordon	St. George
Bonner	Grant	Scott, Pa.
Brooks, La.	Green, Pa.	Sieminski
Brownson	Gwinn	Simpson, Pa.
Buckley	Haskell	Spence
Burdick	Hays, Ark.	Springer
Byrd	Healey	Staggers
Cannon	Hillings	Steed
Carnahan	James	Taylor
Celler	Keating	Teague, Tex.
Chipfield	Kelly, N. Y.	Teller
Collier	Keogh	Tollefson
Colmer	Kluczynski	Vinson
Cooley	Knutson	Vorys
Coudert	Krueger	Vursell
Cramer	Lafore	Wainwright
Cunningham, Nebr.	Lesinski	Whitten
Curtis, Mo.	Lipscomb	Willis
Dawson, Ill.	McGregor	Wilson, Ind.
Dennison	Magnuson	Wright
Derounian	Moore	Yates
	Morgan	Zelenko

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Three hundred and thirty-three Members have answered to their names; a quorum is present.

By unanimous consent, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

ACTIVITIES BY THE ARMED FORCES IN OLYMPIC WINTER GAMES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the

gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill S. 3262, with Mr. NATCHER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from California [Mr. WILSON] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, there is no need to go into a lot of detail and belabor this bill. It was thoroughly discussed and debated last week under suspension of the rules, when there were 256 votes for the bill and 139 against it. If seven Members had voted in the affirmative instead of the negative, the bill would have been passed.

This is the bill that allows the armed services to participate in the VIII Olympic Winter Games that will be held in Squaw Valley, Calif., in 1960.

In 1955 the Congress of the United States invited the nations of the world to hold the Olympic games in this country. Pursuant to that, invitations have gone forth throughout the world inviting participation in those games.

The Olympic Winter Games are one of the outstanding athletic events in the world. The instant bill would authorize the Department of Defense to spend \$500,000 for the purpose of policing, avalanche control, and certain functions are particularly peculiar to them in connection with those games and would provide \$3,500,000 for the building of necessary structures, primarily a nice arena and a memorial building on this site. Those buildings will be put up on federally owned land. The State of California has agreed to rent this land from the Federal Government, through which it will be reimbursed eventually for the money that is being spent.

The State of California has already appropriated \$8 million for those games. We are seeking Federal contribution and Federal support for it. The bill was introduced in the Senate by the Republican leader of the Senate, Senator KNOWLAND, and passed that body unanimously.

It came out of the Armed Services Committee with a unanimous report. The matter is one in which this country is now being called upon to live up to the invitation it extended to the nations of the world to come here and participate in these games.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I suppose this would also sort of show our Ameri-

canism and the things we have in this country that other countries do not have, perhaps, freedom of speech, the five freedoms that we voted down yesterday.

Mr. MILLER of California. I shall leave that up to the gentleman's own interpretation; suffice to say that through the medium of the Olympic games, both regular games and winter games, there has been a coming together of athletes throughout the world that has resulted in a better understanding between the peoples of the countries participating.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think that is true, but yesterday we had before us a bill for a Freedom Monument that would cost the Government no money, yet the gentleman from California voted against that.

Mr. MILLER of California. I am not going to confuse that issue with this; I do not think they have anything in common.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What does this actually cost the United States?

Mr. MILLER of California. There is an authorization for \$500,000; to pay for the use of the troops that will be used in Squaw Valley. About 160 who will do police work and certain avalanche control and trailbreaking through the use of their mountaineering equipment.

We have a favorable report from the Department of Defense. I will read from it:

For a number of years, the Armed Forces have been engaged in research and training for operations in mountain and cold weather conditions and are capable of providing the required assistance with a minimum of orientation and training. In addition, some training benefits will be derived in providing this support.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What happens to the site after the Olympic Games are over? Who is responsible for keeping it up and so forth?

Mr. MILLER of California. The buildings will be federally owned and on federally owned land. The State of California has already contracted with the Federal Government to take over and operate and maintain these buildings as a nice resort facility and park of the State park system.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I wonder if an amendment could not be devised to sort of include the Freedom shrine with this bill so that a double purpose would be accomplished.

Mr. MILLER of California. I suggest that the gentleman have it done in his own beautiful State of Nebraska. We have some very nice things already in the State of California.

Mrs. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mrs. CHURCH. I wish to assure the gentleman of our desire that adequate provision be made in some way for the Olympic Games, but I wonder if the gentleman could give us a little more illumination about the use of the Armed Forces. I find people in my own district who are protesting against the use of

the Armed Forces for such purposes as are described. I notice that the gentleman read from the committee report. I note that the report also says:

The participation of military personnel will be restricted, as pointed out above, to areas of activity which are peculiar to some of our military training programs.

I wonder if the gentleman could give us any further details as to the activity of the Armed Forces and also whether there is any precedent for the use of such Armed Forces in such manner.

Mr. MILLER of California. I cannot answer as to the last, but as the gentleman noted, they will be used for avalanche control, breaking of trails up the mountains through the use of their special equipment, and for policing purposes.

I do not know what the source of the gentlewoman's protest was, but some protests were received by the committee where artisans thought the Armed Forces might be used to do some of the work that would normally be done by the crafts. That is the reason for that provision in the report, to assure that they will not.

Mrs. CHURCH. Are there any precedents for having the members of the services perform this service or similar services?

Mr. MILLER of California. I cannot answer that question.

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GUBSER. I would like to point out to the gentlewoman that there are numerous precedents where members of our armed services have been used in all types of endeavors, for instance rescue work. They, of course, will be doing rescue work in this situation. We have examples of where the members of the armed services have been used in police work at public gatherings. We have numerous incidents where marching teams participate in local celebrations. We have a great many precedents for using members of the armed services in a situation of this kind.

Mrs. CHURCH. I wonder if the gentleman can assure me that this is not establishing a further precedent for using members of the armed services for service outside of their particular call of duty?

Mr. MILLER of California. I do not think that there has ever been an international exposition that we did not send troops to act as honor guards or to participate in them in some way or other. Having been an official in a minor way at the International Exposition in San Francisco in 1940, I may say we had a whole battalion of troops stationed at that exposition to be used in connection with the ceremonies.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHELLEY. I might also advise the gentlewoman from Illinois that it is a regular custom to use members of the United States Coast Guard and the United States Navy, not only for possible

rescue work but in policing the courses where boat races and yacht races are held and in directing traffic and in being of general assistance to the local people.

Mrs. CHURCH. May I ask whether or not the use of the members of the armed services here includes any extraordinary use of military equipment?

Mr. SHELLEY. In those cases I mentioned it did. They used naval patrol vessels, Coast Guard vessels and other equipment, as well as communication equipment for doing almost exactly what is requested here.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TEAGUE of California. In my district we have made arrangements whereby several hundred Seabees who have to be trained in the use of equipment, instead of undergoing this training on flat ground and moving their equipment from one place to another, are now up in our California hills and mountains making firebreaks and doing useful work in connection with their training.

Mr. MILLER of California. Unofficially I have been informed that is one of the things they are going to be used for; that is, as a tryout for certain equipment.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Regarding this \$500,000 or half million dollars to be spent during the games for the use of the services and equipment, presumably to get people up to the place where the contest is. That is for the games?

Mr. MILLER of California. I am afraid that the gentleman has been misinformed as to that. Somehow or other an erroneous idea has crept through that this is quite an isolated place. Squaw Valley is presently a great skiing and winter resort. It is about 9 miles from the railroad and 9 miles from the highway. It will need certain additional work to widen the highways. The State of California, as a matter of fact, is accelerating some \$42 million worth of work on highways to be sure that Highway 40 will be well taken care of so that there is no problem in getting people in and out of Squaw Valley. There has never been a problem in that respect.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Part of this money is to be so spent because it says here on line 6, page 1:

(1) Permit personnel of the Armed Forces under his jurisdiction to prepare courses, fields, and rinks, maintain avalanche control, and provide communications.

The avalanche control can happen year after year?

The point I am making is this: This \$500,000 is for this contest; is that not right?

Mr. MILLER of California. This \$500,000 is in connection with the contest.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. You hope to have contests later, do you not?

Mr. MILLER of California. I do not know. I presume, with the facilities, that there may be, from time to time,

just as they are holding ski meets in other parts of the country and that ski meets will be held here in perpetuity, perhaps.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Now, are we going to be called on every time there is a meeting up there to spend money for avalanche control?

Mr. MILLER of California. I doubt we will be called upon to spend money for that. That is going to be up to each contest.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield.

Mr. SHELLEY. May I venture to offer an explanation here? The \$500,000 in this bill, in fact, all of it, is for use during the period of the Olympic winter games and for the preparations necessary just prior thereto. At the termination of the games the operation of this park or this area then is turned over to the State of California as a State park on a lease basis from the Federal Government, and there will be other contests there. But, those contests will be policed and the communication costs will be borne by the State of California as a State park service.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I would like to ask one further question if I may.

Mr. MILLER of California. Yes.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I think if we have an obligation in this instance, we will probably have an obligation in that instance or in future contests and we will be bothered again. I cannot see much difference. But, another thing that bothers me is this: I wonder if the distinguished gentleman remembers the last time this was up it was said that this was going to be a paying proposition; that it would be a money-making proposition, and that California would recover the costs they are putting into it.

Mr. MILLER of California. I was very happy that the gentleman discussed this during the period when it was up under discussion before. I recall he said he had been a coach of a high school.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Yes.

Mr. MILLER of California. I am not conscious of any athletic events, amateur athletic events, that make money or return profits. I do not think that in any of our high schools or in any of our colleges that that is the case. It serves another purpose. These are international games to bring the people from other parts of the world to this country, as the gentleman from his long athletic experience knows, to bring them together, and for the same reason that our high schools benefit from athletic competition with other high schools. And, we have intersectional high school games and that sort of thing, and it serves a great purpose in this country, and it is just part of that same athletic pattern.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I would like to tell the gentleman that I do not know where they get the money from when they run contests in your State, but wherever I have been connected with athletics, we never ask for tax money to support athletics.

Mr. MILLER of California. Well, I do not know.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Especially Federal money.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I notice in section 2 on page 2 it refers to moneys appropriated by Congress, tax moneys, "for the specific purpose, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to advance to the organizing committee," and then it says "a nonprofit corporation of the State of California." Who makes up the membership of this nonprofit corporation that is going to use the taxpayers' money?

Mr. MILLER of California. Well, I cannot give you all the members of the committee. The chairman of the committee is Mr. Robert Georgio, who is well known in California and one of its outstanding citizens. He is a producer of fruit, the Georgio Fruit Co.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is it the same group that is connected with the Freedom Foundation that makes up that group?

Mr. MILLER of California. I will say to the gentleman that I know nothing about the Freedom Foundation other than what I heard here yesterday.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Who makes up the nonprofit corporation of the State of California? We ought to know who the membership is.

Mr. MILLER of California. A group of enthusiasts who got together for this purpose, to bring these Eighth Olympic winter games to this country.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Is it not just a little unusual for tax moneys to be turned over first to the Secretary of Defense and then to a nonprofit corporation to spend as they see fit?

Mr. MILLER of California. I do not think it is a bit exceptional to do that. If the gentleman would like, I could run down from the time of the Pan American Exposition in Buffalo in 1901 down to the New York Fair and the International Fair, even State and regional fairs and expositions that have had money appropriated to them by the Federal Government.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. MILLER of California. I would be happy to, but I should like to ask the gentleman to forget the Freedom Shrine.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I shall not mention the Freedom Shrine. That did not cost the taxpayers any money. I am referring to this nonprofit corporation. Are there any restrictions on how they shall spend the taxpayers' money, the money we are going to turn over to them through the Secretary of Defense?

Mr. MILLER of California. The money provided will be spent by the Secretary of Defense, not to exceed \$500,000, for the troops that will be brought in. The other \$3½ million will be spent for the field building and the ice arena, which are positive assets and which will become part of the property of the Federal Government.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's viewpoint with regard to these Olympic games. I think we in the House are getting a little picayune when we think that \$4 million is too much to spend on an international event such as the winter Olympics. When they were held in Germany, at Garmisch, the German Government put up a vast sum of money to support those games and to see that they were carried through successfully. These games are held quadrennially. I think it ill behooves us to do less than is proposed here through the passage of this bill.

Mr. MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we heard the pros and cons of this legislation previously, and I am not going to dwell on those points. However, I would like to reemphasize 1 or 2 points that I feel are important. We have extended an invitation to the athletes of 37 nations to participate in the winter olympics. That invitation has been accepted. Certainly at this late date we cannot say, "We are sorry but we are just not in a position to take care of you."

The State of California certainly has demonstrated its good faith, too. The State was told that the olympics would cost some \$1 million. Later it was determined that it would cost \$8 million. The State has appropriated \$8 million out of its tax revenues for the olympics.

We have a problem out there. I hate to admit that as a Californian, but we have the problem of too much snow in California, in Squaw Valley. But this will be of real benefit to the winter olympics. The United States had the winter olympics in 1932 at Lake Placid in New York. We did not have any snow up there at that time and our faces are still red because of it. This area that we are talking about, Squaw Valley, has adequate snow each year and we are going to put on one of the finest winter olympics that has ever been put on in any part of the world.

We have asked 1,000 athletes and 200 newspapermen to come here. Certainly we cannot put on anything less than the very finest. The prestige of the United States is at stake in this matter, and I am hopeful the House will give overwhelming approval to this proposed legislation.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WILSON of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman about a remark he made when this matter was up for debate on March 19. It is at page 4259 of the RECORD. He pointed out the fact that the olympics were held in Los Angeles in 1932 and he said:

We built an entire Olympic Village to house all of the participants in the 1932 olympics.

My question is, Who is "we"?

Mr. WILSON of California. It was my understanding that the Federal Government financed the construction of the Olympic Village in Los Angeles. It was later turned into a Federal housing project.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Did the Federal Government participate in that venture?

Mr. WILSON of California. That is my understanding.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. How much was the Federal appropriation at that time?

Mr. WILSON of California. I do not have those figures, but I have been told that that is the case.

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of California. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Inasmuch as a number of the gentlemen from the California delegation have spoken up, I thought I might say that there is interest in this body on the part of other Representatives, including those from the eastern seaboard. I think it is perhaps too obvious to need saying that there is a national interest in providing adequate evidence of our hospitality in connection with these Olympic games.

I think it would be very unwise—the international complications would be obvious if we should fail to come up with reasonable facilities such as would be made available under this bill. I trust it passes.

Mr. WILSON of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DOOLEY. I want to point out that while we are raising money for the construction of the facilities for the winter Olympics the funds for the games themselves are raised by public subscription. That has been the custom over the years.

It would seem to me to be highly inequitable that full and proper consideration be not given to the important matter before us. The winter olympic games are an extension and part of the general olympic contests which are held quadrennially.

Today, more than ever before, the world needs the motivation initiated by Baron Pierre de Coubertin, the founder of the olympic games who, in the early 1890's, had the vision to foresee the importance of athletic contests between the athletes of the nations of the world with the aim of developing a spirit of understanding and genuine friendship.

While occasionally, down through the years, an isolated incident has marred the even tenor of the athletic contests, they have in general served supurbly the purposes for which they were instituted. Today more than ever, the commingling

of the athletes of various nations on the democratic field of play and on the ice rinks and slalom courses of the winter olympics goes a long way toward creating better understanding and good will among people of different nationalities.

The cost for the construction of adequate facilities to hold the winter olympic games at Squaw Valley, Calif., is an insignificant amount of money compared to what it will purchase in the way of better understanding on the part of the young people of the competing nations. I strongly favor the passage of this measure and support it wholeheartedly.

Mr. WILSON of California. That is correct.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of California. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I am still concerned over who makes up this nonprofit organization. Who are some of the individuals?

Mr. WILSON of California. I do not have a list of the Board of Directors, but I can give some of the names. They are some of the leading citizens of California and some of the sports figures of this country. I will be glad to supply a list of the Board of Directors.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. How about the mechanics of this? The money is turned over by the Congress to the Secretary of Defense, and then he turns it over to this nonprofit organization?

Mr. WILSON of California. I do not believe the gentleman is quite right as to the expenditure by the military. The military will be reimbursed for what expenses are deemed necessary for following out this legislation. They certainly are not going to turn any money over to anyone to use. This is merely to reimburse the services for what efforts they put forth.

Mr. BALDWIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. BALDWIN. May I congratulate the gentleman on the statement he has made in behalf of this bill, and point out that the wording of section 2 of the bill specifically states that these funds should be turned over to this corporation to construct this particular sports arena. I am quite certain that the Secretary of Defense will take adequate steps to insure that the purposes of this bill will be carried out.

Mr. SHELLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. SHELLEY. I think also it should be pointed out to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] and those who asked about the nonprofit organization and the extension of funds that if they will refer to line 25 on page 2 of the bill they will find these words:

The expenditure of such funds by the committee is subject to such audit and control as the Comptroller General of the United States may prescribe.

That is, when the agreement is signed between the nonprofit organization. This is providing nothing but what is

done in connection with every Olympic games, every international exhibit, and every trade fair. A nonprofit organization under our general laws is set up to handle the financing thereof.

Mr. WILSON of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. DOYLE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. DOYLE. I perhaps can offer this definite information in answer to the question of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER] because I had the pleasant experience of being the subchairman of rowing in the Olympic games in California in 1932. At that time I came in touch with the practical operations of the Olympic Committee. This nonprofit corporation operates under the direct supervision and control of the United States Division of the International Olympic Committee. I want to make it clear that the International Olympic Committee, the United States section thereof, is in close and immediate control of the whole construction of this enterprise.

Mr. WILSON of California. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. WILSON of California. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Since it is a nonprofit corporation organized under the laws of the State of California there must be some personnel directly responsible. I was trying to find out who that personnel may be.

Mr. WILSON of California. The United States section of the International Olympic Committee cooperates with this nonprofit corporation which is organized with the personnel under their direction, and they do not get any salary or remuneration or per diem for their services.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. That is a rather nebulous something. Certainly if they are organized under the laws of the State of California they must be registered there. I presume you require that as we require it in Nebraska. I am trying to find out who are the personnel of this organization that is going to spend the taxpayers' money.

Mr. WILSON of California. I have seen the list of the board of directors. They are reputable citizens. I will be happy to furnish the gentleman with a list as soon as we have concluded the consideration of this measure.

Mr. SHELLEY. If the gentleman will yield further, the chairman of this nonprofit organization is Mr. DiGiorgio, who is registered in California as a Republican and is on the Republican Finance Committee in the State of California. They are all behind him.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. In the debate on March 19 the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] inserted some comment in the RECORD relating to a Mr. Cushing who, he said, was the chief promoter. Is he in this nonprofit organization?

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Cushing has not had anything to do with this organization for over 2 years. He has no part in either the planning or the operation of this Winter Olympic Games.

Mr. GROSS. Does that account for this statement, then, when he said, "I truthfully do not see the need for this extravagance but as far as I am concerned my feeling would not be hurt if they would spend \$120 million"?

Mr. WILSON of California. He is obviously not responsible in making a statement like that. As I said, for the last 2 years he has had no connection with the Winter Olympics.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has consumed 10 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, will these shouts of "vote" hasten the vote any or prevent the demand for the reading of the engrossed copy of the bill?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, each side is entitled to 30 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then, under the rule, Mr. Chairman, will the bill be read for amendment as usual under the 5-minute rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The bill will be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may require.

Mr. Chairman, I want to add to the names that I have mentioned. I have some additional information which I think will be of interest to the gentleman from Nebraska. The question was asked as to who the members were. One member is Mr. Allen Christiansen who is the president of the Utah Construction Co. Another member and distinguished citizen is Mr. Charles Blythe, president of Blythe & Co. Another member is Mr. Prentiss Hall, chairman of the board of Broadway-Hall Stores. Another member is Robert DiGiorgio, vice president of the DiGiorgio Fruit Co. and one of California's most distinguished and reputable citizens.

Mr. Chairman, I now yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Chairman, the situation seems to be getting bigger and bigger insofar as the appropriations and authorizations are concerned. There does not seem to be any limit. Frankly, this proposition has been a good deal like Topsy. It just grew. It started off with the idea that it was a million dollar proposition and the State of California passed a bill providing \$1 million. They got into it and then they found they wanted this big coliseum to accommodate 30,000 people and they wanted a lot of roads and trails and other facilities to provide ice breaking machinery and crawlers to carry the people up to this place to let them view the activities. Now it has gone up to \$8 million being requested of the State of California and \$4 million being requested of the Federal Government. What it will ultimately be, I do not know. There

is a place in Idaho—rather, there are many places in Idaho with hotels that are all ready, with ski runs of all kinds being operated during a considerable part of the year and, of course, during the winter season. They could have taken advantage of those facilities if they cared to go there without any trouble. There are also many ski runs around Lake Placid and many hotels to take care of people if they wanted to go there. Then they would not have had to ask the Government to put up any money to handle that sort of thing. Maybe we can do this sort of thing. But, frankly, it seems to me that we are making a mistake in trying to go ahead with this activity on such an elaborate scale.

A year ago we turned down four or five million, I do not remember which, to the city of Cleveland. I think it was 5 million asked for a sports carnival. There was a lot of feeling on the part of the people of Cleveland that we should not have turned them down. Frankly, I think that it had progressed just as far as this has, and I do not see why we should turn down one group and turn the other loose with \$4 million of the taxpayers' money.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. I do not think the turning down of \$5 million for Cleveland last year or the year before had any effect at all upon any of the dictators of South America. Does the gentleman think that it did?

Mr. TABER. Well, I do not know.

Mr. GROSS. I think our political relations are about the same with South America as they always have been.

Mr. TABER. That is probably so. I suppose there would be quite a gathering of people who would be interested in this sort of thing; but, frankly, I do not see how the Federal Government can afford to go into it.

Mr. DOOLEY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. DOOLEY. There is no similarity between the games in Cleveland and the games at Squaw Valley.

Mr. TABER. Oh, yes there is.

Mr. DOOLEY. One was a Pan American undertaking and the other is the national Olympics, which go back to 1896. They are far superior.

Mr. TABER. Of course the Olympic business, outdoor athletic contest, is a different thing than the outdoor activities in Cleveland. But it is all the same general principle. There is no difference to amount to anything. If we could afford to pay for one we could afford to pay for the other.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] has expired.

Mr. WILSON of California. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I would like to ask a question about section 3:

On or before April 1, 1960, any lease by the United States of the property on which the arena authorized by section 2 is located shall be reviewed and lease occupancy thereafter shall include a fair and appropriate rental

reflecting the added value and utility represented by the arena.

The question I have is this: Is a contract for rental made with a nonprofit corporation who apparently is building the arena to start with?

Mr. MILLER of California. The reason for that provision is this: That is about the time that the arena will be built. It will then be rented by the State of California, so that the rental to the State of California will be fixed by the Federal Government at that time. The State will rent it from the Federal Government and will continue to rent it and use it for recreational purposes.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I wonder if we should not write that in there. It says "authorized by section 2." Section 2 provides for an organizing committee known as Squaw Valley, Inc., a nonprofit corporation of the State of California. They must be the ones who will get the lease.

Mr. MILLER of California. The lease will be made by the Federal Government to the State of California.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. What will be a fair and proper rental for the lease?

Mr. MILLER of California. That is put in there to safeguard the interests of the Federal Government. I cannot tell you what a fair and proper rental will be. Suffice it to say that when that date comes—this is on Department of Agriculture land, and I suppose they will be the ones to enter into the contract of providing a contract with the State of California. At that time they will determine the rental value and it will have to be approved by the General Accounting Office—full fiscal responsibility of the United States Government, to make sure it is getting proper remuneration for the use of the land.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Then there was no estimate as to what a fair and reasonable rental might be.

Mr. MILLER of California. I do not think anyone can tell what a fair and reasonable rental would be.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER].

Mr. GUBSER. Mr. Chairman, I think the issues here are very simple:

First. We have invited some guests. The question is, Are we going to provide for the guests whom this Congress has invited?

Second. We are spending \$500,000 to assist in the training of our snow and alpine troops. Most of the \$500,000 will be spent for training of these troops whether it is provided for in this bill or not. It is merely a question of whether it is going to be spent in Squaw Valley or somewhere else.

Third. We are spending \$3,500,000 for buildings, title to which will remain in the United States Government. In addition to that, the State of California will be erecting buildings on Federal property and title will be vested in the Federal Government. Thus, so far as the \$3,500,000 investment is concerned, we are going to get back a lot more than we put in. In other words, we will make a profit.

I have always thought that sometimes the best way to kill a piece of legislation is to keep on talking about it. So I suggest that we quit talking and vote to give this measure our overwhelming approval.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. There being no further requests for time, the Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, (a) notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of a military department may, with respect of the VIII Olympic Winter Games—

(1) permit personnel of the Armed Forces under his jurisdiction to prepare courses, fields, and rinks, maintain avalanche control, and provide communications;

(2) lend necessary equipment; and

(3) provide such other support as he considers appropriate.

(b) The Secretary of the military department concerned may spend such funds for the purposes of this section as Congress may specifically appropriate for those purposes. He may acquire and utilize such supplies, material, and equipment as he determines to be necessary to provide the support authorized by this section.

(c) The authority provided to the Secretaries of the military departments by this section is permissive and not mandatory.

Mr. MILLER of California (interrupting the reading of the bill). Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered as read and open to amendment at any point.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, this is a short bill. I object.

(The Clerk continued reading.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

(Mr. GROSS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California [Mr. GUBSER] says that we must appropriate \$4 million because an invitation was extended. I am sure that no Member, when this innocuous invitation went through the House—and we are accustomed to passing them frequently—had the slightest idea that anyone was going to ask for \$4 million and the use of the military to implement the invitation.

Public Law 69, which is printed in the hearings and which is verbatim the invitation, can be read backward and forward and there is not one word or even a hint that the sponsors would come to Congress for a single dime. Yet all the taxpayers of the country are confronted now with a bill for \$4 million to build ski slides and skating rinks, plus a winter resort in California.

What the sponsors of this proposition are doing is making it necessary that when similar invitations are extended in the future that amendments be offered prohibiting the use of Federal funds.

In the past I have been charitable in letting most of these invitations go through because I took them at face value. I can assure you that will not be the case in the future. There is no reason in the world why the taxpayers

of Iowa should be compelled to help underwrite this kind of an enterprise and in the amount proposed. And that goes for the taxpayers of the Nation.

In the proposition before us a lease or a contract is provided—I do not know its terms and conditions; we have no knowledge of it whatever. Can it be possible that the State of California under the terms of a lease negotiated with the Federal Government is not going to be quite as bighearted as we are led to believe?

Is this going to be a 30-year lease? Is the State of California going to recover the \$8 million it puts in over the 30-year period? Who is going to control admissions and concessions at this resort?

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MILLER of California. The language here is the usual language that goes into these things. We cannot negotiate this lease on the floor of the House. It is not our function to negotiate it. It is an administrative function. Language of this kind is contained in all types of legislation where leases will be effected. As far as concessions and those things are concerned, when the State takes this over I assume, or I know I will tell the gentleman, that the same rules and regulations of the State of California applies in all the parks that it operates as a part of the recreational life of its people. Where they maintain facilities, they are let on a concession basis with a limited amount of money that may be charged. The concessions are bid on in the same manner that they are bid on in Federal parks. The public is assured and given the same protection in California State parks that they are assured of in the national parks.

Mr. GROSS. Is it proposed to charge admission to this place after you get through with the Olympic games?

Mr. MILLER of California. There is only one State park where admission is charged. That is at the Mount Diablo State Park where you pay 25 cents a car. Because it goes up a very tortuous highway, that money is used to maintain the highway. I do not know of any other State parks in California where admissions are charged.

Mr. GROSS. You have a lease with the Federal Government. This is not strictly a State park. The gentleman, I am sure, will agree to that.

Mr. MILLER of California. It is going to be let and used as a part of the State park facilities.

Mr. GROSS. You are going to lease it for about 30 years, and I am sure the State of California hopes to get its \$8 million or a substantial part of it back by the end of 30 years.

Mr. MILLER of California. I do not think the people of California are so recreational conscious that they want to make a profit on it. I think they might like to enter into a deal to buy it, or inasmuch as part of this is agricultural land and part of it is forest land, to use it for that purpose.

Mr. GROSS. It is a mortal cinch that taxpayers and the Federal Government will not get their money back?

Mr. MILLER of California. Oh, yes. If I know the General Accounting Office, I am satisfied that the Federal Government will get its money.

Mr. GROSS. Will get its money back?

Mr. MILLER of California. Yes.

Mr. GROSS. Then would the gentleman be opposed to an amendment to the bill providing that the Federal Government be reimbursed for the \$4 million it puts up?

Mr. MILLER of California. After the 30-year period?

Mr. GROSS. No.

Mr. MILLER of California. I am not going to consent to any amendment.

Mr. GROSS. I did not think the gentleman would.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

(By unanimous consent (at the request of Mr. GROSS) he was allowed to proceed for 5 additional minutes.)

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I would like to ask where in the bill is it stated that the State of California will take over this area. It says:

As completed, the arena becomes the property of the United States.

The assumption of the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] is that the State of California will take over the area at some time. I see no place in the bill providing that it be taken over by the State. There is a provision for leasing the arena but it does not say the State of California will take it over.

Mr. MILLER of California. Read on. The State of California will maintain it as a part of its State park and recreational system.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Where is that in the bill?

Mr. MILLER of California. It does not have to be in the bill. It is a part of the agreement that they already have with the State.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. We do not know anything about that.

Mr. MILLER of California. The State of California is putting \$3 million into this project. It is not going to put \$8 million in this project unless it will inure to the benefit of the people of the State of California.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Then there should be an amendment to section 3 saying that the property will be leased to the State of California and not leave it in the dark.

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I yield.

Mr. WILSON of California. The property is already leased to the State of California by the Federal Government and the purpose of section 3 is to allow renegotiations of the lease when the property is improved.

Mr. GROSS. Now we are getting somewhere. The lease has already been made, and yet we have none of the terms

of the lease available for the Members of the House.

Mr. WILSON of California. The United States has leased the property for use as a park.

Mr. GROSS. And that is all that amounts to. You have all the concessions; you can operate it for 30 years; is that correct?

Mr. WILSON of California. The purpose of section 3 is to allow us to negotiate to see that a proper lease is obtained by the State of California.

Mr. GROSS. And for 30 years you are going to operate a winter resort that is paid for in part by all the taxpayers in the United States.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GROSS. I am glad to yield to my friend from Nebraska.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I have been on the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, dealing with parks, for 16 years, and I recall no lease of this park to the State of California. If there is such a lease arrangement in existence, I should certainly like to see it. Those leases go through the committee.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, as I said on March 19, this very definitely establishes a precedent. I do not know of any time, certainly in the 10 years that I have been around in the House, that the Federal Government has provided troops, bulldozers, tractors, excavators, trucks, and everything else to build up a winter resort for any State. Now, that is one of the precedents that you will be establishing if you pass this bill and if the Committee on Appropriations puts up the money for it, which I hope it will not.

Mr. Chairman, this is another raid upon the Treasury at a time when the deficit is starting to soar into outer space. This is bad legislation and it ought to be defeated.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 1, line 4, after the word "of" strike out "a military department" and insert the word "Defense."

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, it has developed so far that the United States owns the land and has leased it to the State of California—if I am in error, the gentleman will correct me—and that we are to put in \$4 million of the taxpayers' money to enhance its value and make it useful and productive. Is that right so far? And, while the corporation to which part of this is advanced—it says—is nonprofit, there is not a word anywhere so far as I can learn which tells us where or indicates where the profits from the operation after the games are over are to go. Will the gentleman tell me; someone sponsoring the bill? Who is to get the profit from its future rental or use?

Mr. WILSON of California. There is not going to be any profit; if I judge properly the operation of the olympics

these are rarely profitmaking operations and the bill specifically points out that it is a nonprofit corporation that is asking for this concession.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am not talking about profits from the olympic games. I am talking about the 30-year period after the games are over when somebody leases it. There is no previous legislation so far as I can find which prevents the State of California subletting part or all of this area as improved, is there? It looks to me like a speculator or some real estate fellow had or expects to have something to do with it. Of course, he has not at this time but I mean it has some of the characteristics of that. Am I right about that?

Mr. WILSON of California. The State of California operates a number of parks in California on a reputable basis, and this will be operated just as any other State park in California. There probably will be some concessionaires who operate some similar concessions. But, the State will make a lease with the Federal Government and the State will see that the Federal Government gets a reasonable sum each year for the use of the property in question.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Presumably, then, we are putting in \$4 million in improvements and the State has the privilege of subleasing to private individuals for their profit and also for the profit of the State. That is about the way it boils down, is it not?—and at the expense of all—and all contribute a part of the \$4 million.

Mr. WILSON of California. Not exactly.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Well, pretty near to exactly.

Now, the amendment is on page 1, line 4. You notice the Secretary of a military department may do this, that, and the other. All the amendment proposes is to strike out "Secretary of a military department" and put in "Secretary of Defense." I am trying to consolidate the thing so someone will be responsible. Any objection to that? There is no Secretary of a military department. If there is then as has been admitted there are three of him. I am asking whoever is in charge of the bill, is there any objection to that amendment?

Mr. MILLER of California. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Why?

Mr. MILLER of California. When the gentleman has finished his argument, when his 5 minutes are up, I shall answer.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will someone on this side tell me what the gentleman said and what he meant and why he cannot or will not answer?

Mr. WILSON of California. He said he would like to have 5 minutes to answer the gentleman's argument.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That I know. Cannot the gentleman tell me yes or no?

Mr. MILLER of California. I will be very glad to tell the gentleman, when his time has expired. I expect to use 5 minutes then.

Mr. HOFFMAN. It must be a tough one to answer, if it cannot give it short of 5 minutes. All I am trying to do is to

help you along, and get the authority to spend that \$4 billion in one place by one individual, so that responsibility can be fixed, to prevent three Secretaries trying to hide the little black ball under one of the half-walnut shelves.

Mr. MILLER of California. If the gentleman has sufficient time left, I will say that the reason the Department of Defense is not included there is, for example, that the Secretary of Defense has no authority over the properties of the military departments, so that any contracts that have to be entered into must be entered into either with the Army, the Navy, or the Air Force, the traditional secretaries who are authorized by law to do that. The Secretary of Defense exercises no property control whatsoever.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That sounds all right, but everyone here knows very well that the Secretaries of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force do what the Secretary of Defense tells them to do. That is if he can learn what each is to do. What you have in this bill is three Secretaries; three of them are to spend this money, each going his own way, each denying responsibility for any waste or wrong that may occur.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 2, line 3, strike out the words "the military department concerned" and insert the word "Defense."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is about the same as the other. Do you realize what this bill does? On page 1 it says that the Secretary of a military department and there is no such individual unless there are three of him—may "permit personnel of the Armed Forces under his jurisdiction to prepare courses, fields, and rinks" and so forth; almost anything he wants to. And he can "lend necessary equipment" and "provide such other support as he considers appropriate."

That gives to one secretary—we do not know who he is; is that the Secretary of the Army? Will someone tell me, is that Mr. Brucker, or is it the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of the Air Force? Which one are you going to have do that? Spending under section 1 (1), (2), (3), and (b) and (c) and who is to spend under section 2 of the bill?

Mr. WILSON of California. It is the secretary of whichever department is concerned.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Sure. Any old secretary. But which one?

Mr. WILSON of California. I would suggest that the gentleman use his time to develop his case and we will be very happy to answer later.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is just avoiding the issue. I suspect the gentleman just does not know. I am sincere about this I would like to know what the idea is of

dividing this spending of \$4 million hard-earned tax dollars up among these three Secretaries Is the Secretary of the Army going to lend these trucks, or is that service or a comparable one to be done by the Secretary of the Navy or the Secretary of the Air Force?

Mr. WILSON of California. I wish I could answer the gentleman, but I cannot. It will be one of the services.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman does not know; just anybody can spend so long as the money is available.

Mr. WILSON of California. Either the Navy or the Army.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. GROSS. It covers all of those services.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But only one at a time? Or do all three spend at once? And which one is limited to the \$500,000? I do not want to dispute my colleague, because he knows more about these bills than I do, but on page 1, paragraph (1) it says: "permit personnel of the Armed Forces under his jurisdiction." Does that refer to Secretary Brucker?

Suppose one of the boys want to fly in—that would require the consent of the Secretary of Air.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman should go back to line 4 preceding where it provides that "the Secretary of a military department may."

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is what I am trying to make clear. As it stands, all three have equal authority to spend. Oh, what a time the three will have spending \$4 million.

Mr. GROSS. It could be any one of them.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I just want to know who is going to operate under the language on page 1, line 6.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman is not going to find out because they do not know.

Mr. HOFFMAN. They might have some idea.

Mr. WILSON of California. I would say there is a limitation on the total amount that can be spent of \$500,000.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no; there is not.

Mr. WILSON of California. There is a limitation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no; I have an amendment to offer to put a limitation on it.

Mr. WILSON of California. I would say further that whichever Department of Defense can most economically do the job will be asked to do it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Economy is out when the services compete. The gentleman is aware of the trouble we have had in trying to get unification. We tried in 1948, we wrote a bill, and we never could get the three Departments to work together. Here you come along now and authorize any one of these Secretaries, each of the three, any one of them, and each of them to do certain things. Suppose they compete again? Suppose the Army says, "No, we are going to take them in by truck." The Navy says, "No, they will have to get in another way; as near as they can by

water—then by plane or auto." Then those who take over, who are progressive, will say, "We are going to fly them in all the way from—wherever they say."

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I think the committee should remember that legally there is no military department any more. It is done away with. It is called the Department of Defense. This term "military department" does not fit into the language used now, because they always refer to a department of defense.

Mr. HOFFMAN. That is true and one reason for 1 of the 3 amendments. The point is this: Here you say that someone—the gentleman from Nebraska says there is no such thing as a military department, but 1 of the 3 armed services or all 3 shall do all of these things. Refer to paragraphs 1, 2, and 3, and look at the third one, "provide such other report as he considers appropriate." There is no limit. You authorize one Secretary to go ahead there. Then another one here is authorized to do something. You have three of them with no statement as to which one should spend the money, and get complimentary tickets to the games to give to V. I. P.'s.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GROSS. Since we cannot fix any financial responsibility here, how would it be to provide for the acceptance of the lowest bid on the part of the Secretary?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The armed services. Oh, well, they cannot compete that way. We have seen that fail.

Mr. GROSS. Then make it the highest bid.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No. There is merit to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and rise in support of the bill.

Mr. Chairman, this is not an unusual expenditure that is before us. We have many times in the past appropriated money for expositions at which they had sports and which had an international appeal. I find on investigation, for illustration, that the Pan American Exposition in Buffalo in 1901 received \$1,015,000. The South Carolina Interstate and West Indian Exposition received \$250 million. The Panama-Pacific International Exposition received \$1,374,000.

Mr. GROSS. If the gentleman will yield, the gentleman just said \$250 million. It never went quite that high.

Mr. MARTIN. I might be pardoned if I say billions instead of millions. When we hit the moon we will probably be talking in trillions. But I accept the correction.

The Pan American Exposition at Dallas, \$3 million.

The Pan American Exposition at Tampa, \$100,000.

The New York World's Fair, \$3,275,000.

The Golden Gate International Exposition, \$1,700,000.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, there are all indications that the Government has been interested in expositions which develop good will throughout the world. Now we are being asked to spend \$4 million in California. Why not? California is the second largest taxpaying State in the Union. They do not come here very often and ask for money, and I think when they do come here we should give them the consideration they are entitled to. They contribute generously when other States ask for aid. I believe this will promote good will. Let us take our own case as an illustration. We have an Interparliamentary Union. Our members attend these meetings in other countries across the water. Then the time comes when our country must entertain and has to pick up the check. That is what this situation amounts to. Thirty-six years have elapsed since we have had the Olympic Games in America. We have been sending teams to these other countries. It is our turn. Now, why is it wrong after we have invited these people to come here and after we have advertised the invitation all over the world—it would be unfortunate to back out. Do we want to stand before the world as a welcher? I do not believe we will do that. I hope we can pass this bill promptly and unanimously and hope I can induce my two friends vigorously fighting the measure to join the great majority.

May I further say it is much pleasanter to struggle for athletic supremacy than it is to engage intensely in military struggles. Through these athletic games we can bring the people of the world closer together and aid in heralding the day of universal peace.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on the bill, and all amendments thereto, close in 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

Mr. GROSS. I object.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on the bill, and all amendments thereto, close in 10 minutes, the last 5 minutes to be assigned to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 2, line 9, after the word "the" strike out "Secretaries of the military departments" and insert "Secretary of Defense."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Did the gentleman from California make the motion to limit debate on this amendment and all other amendments thereto?

The CHAIRMAN. The motion of the gentleman from California was to limit

debate on the bill and all amendments thereto in 5 minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask if I may withdraw this amendment which was just read and offer the next one.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, I object.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard.

The gentleman from Michigan is recognized to speak in support of his amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I waive my argument. Let us vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer another amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 2, line 8, after the period add "Provided, That the fair value of the assistance given under section 1 shall not exceed \$500,000."

Mr. WILSON of California. Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state the point of order.

Mr. WILSON of California. I think that amendment is pretty well covered in section 4. Or, Mr. Chairman, may I propound that as a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from California is not being recognized on my time, I hope.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California raises a point that is not a matter for the Chair to pass upon.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, the boys are getting a little hasty, but they will not make very much progress that way. These amendments are being offered in good faith. They are an attempt to centralize the spending of this money. This last amendment is an attempt to limit the spending to \$4 million. There is \$3,500,000 in the very last paragraph of the bill for one purpose and there is also another item that authorizes to be appropriated not to exceed \$500,000 to carry out the purpose—of what? Of section 1. The \$3,500,000 is to carry out the purpose of the other section—No. 2. All I am trying to do by this amendment is to prohibit the spending by these various secretaries, and you have 3 of them, of more than \$500,000 which purports to be according to the statement of the gentleman, the limitation on that spending money.

If the sponsors were sincere about it and want to limit the sum which these three Secretaries can spend—

Mr. WILSON of California. If the gentleman will yield, I perhaps misunderstood the intent of the gentleman's amendment. I would like to ask the gentleman if section 4 on page 3 does not pretty well carry out the purpose of his amendment. It does limit the action on \$500,000 in section 1.

Mr. HOFFMAN. No; it does not, because you have several Secretaries, three of them, spending. It just mentions those particular services in section 1, others in section 2. There is no reason why the Secretary of the Armed Forces who spends under section 1 could not spend the amount up to whatever he thinks is right of \$500,000. What are you going to do with another Secretary who spends under subsection (b) of section 1? You have another Secretary spending under section 2. He can spend an additional sum. If you intend to limit total spending to \$500,000 in addition to the \$3,500,000, why do you not accept the amendment and be done with it?

Mr. WILSON of California. Section 4 pretty well covers the intent of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, no. If I thought it covered it, limited the spending of the three Secretaries to a total of \$500,000 in addition to the \$3,500,000, I would not have offered the amendment to this section.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. GROSS. The gentleman spoke about appropriations for other organizations and expositions, and among them he mentioned the Interparliamentary Union, and the sending of delegates all over the world and inviting their delegates to this country. Of course, there never was any better junketing organization in Congress than the Interparliamentary Union. They did have a meeting here 3 or 4 years ago. It was held in this House Chamber, and the dining room was open downstairs. Instead of those delegates from other countries paying their own bills for meals, they simply walked out down there and left the checks. Time after time they did that. The gentleman is right about this bill being in keeping with some of that stuff, because here the taxpayers' pockets are being reached into to pay for a specific purpose in California. I like to be bighearted, and I am sure the gentleman does, but we do not like to have our pockets picked all the time.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield.

Mr. SCHWENGEL. I would like to set the record straight on some statements made on the floor of the House about precedents, and about what is right and wrong in athletic games and in the promotion of these games. Somebody said the Federal Government helped before. I question that, because I was interested in the Olympic games the last time they were held here in 1932. I had a fellow who was fortunate enough to win second place, so I had a very special interest in it. The statement was made that the Federal Government participated before. I have quite a lengthy document to prove that that is not so. I would like to quote from Mr. Roy Manning, of the Library of Congress, who offers this statement:

My report does not say what I told to you in just that language. But I repeat my

statement that, from my study of a couple years ago, I have no recollection of any financing provided by the United States other than sending of the military personnel. In fact there was general opposition to any Federal participation on the part of the Olympic committee.

An indirect financing is provided by the exemption of gifts from taxation.

Our distinguished leader on this side said we have been in the habit of paying for expositions. I have attended some of those expositions, but there has been no Olympic contest in any of those.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN] has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer a preferential motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. HOFFMAN moves that the Committee do now rise and report the bill back to the House with the recommendation that the enacting clause be stricken.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MORANO. Is there an amendment pending?

The CHAIRMAN. There is an amendment pending at this time.

Mr. MORANO. Which one will be acted on first?

The CHAIRMAN. The last amendment will be acted on first.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If my motion is defeated can there be further debate on the pending amendment, since time for debate has been limited?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair informs the gentleman that all debate will be concluded in 5 minutes.

Mr. MORANO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry?

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield for a parliamentary inquiry? It will come out of his time.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the Chair inform me how much time I have?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. MORANO. As I understand, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan moves to strike out the enacting clause.

The CHAIRMAN. That is the pending motion.

Mr. MORANO. Do not the rules of the House provide that there may be 5 minutes debate in opposition to strike the enacting clause?

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. NATCHER). That would be the case ordinarily, but in this particular instance the Committee adopted a motion closing all debate on the bill in 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

(Mr. HOFFMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, my distinguished leader, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN], with refer-

ence to the request for \$4 million for the games, asks, Why not?

It may not be over in your district; maybe not on the east coast; maybe not in the district of our colleague, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], when they did have some employment, when cotton fabrics were still in style. Even today your people were not in want.

Why not? Permit me to give my reason for "why not?" It is easy enough to stand here and vote to give away someone else's money, some of it worked for out in the fields, some in the factories, some behind the counter, some in the office. As long as it belongs to someone else, has been earned and saved by another, it is easy enough to vote to give it away. Oh, how easy and how pleasurable it is to be generous with the other fellow's dollar.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Now, I am sorry indeed. I will vote for your next reasonable bill for veterans. Let it go at that. It is the first time I ever declined to yield to a lady, but this request must be regretfully declined.

Going back to the gentleman's question, and I have unparalleled admiration for his ability and sincerity, but there are in the Fourth Congressional District of Michigan some distressing conditions, if half of what we have heard from the majority side during the last 2 or 3 weeks is true, in Detroit and Wayne County, on the eastern side of Michigan, they are in far worse plight than we are over on the west side than the people of other lands to whose aid our people have contributed not a little. It is not demagoguery to say that we have many and many an individual and family over on the west side of Michigan, and they have thousands of them, more than a hundred thousand in Wayne County who just do not have and cannot get jobs and who do not have money to buy the food they should have in order to sustain them in just a decent way. Nor do they have funds to meet their obligations. They are in dire need. That is "why not" as far as I am concerned. I cannot at this time vote to give \$4 million to aid in providing entertainment—pleasure rather than necessities. I get those letters from my people telling of their need for jobs, for funds to buy food, clothing, rent—meet the payment on a home, a household appliance—we do not have dollars for them, but we do have 4 million for "games." Not me. If it did not cost so much I would have those letters printed in the RECORD, because there are hundreds of them. But so doing might give encouragement to the Communists. The situation takes me back to the time when the late President Roosevelt said that one-third of the population was ill-fed, ill-clothed, and ill-housed, and we must do something for them. Here we are back again. Now, before I vote for \$4 million, tax dollars, appropriations unguarded as these are, with no prospect of return for adult playboys to perform, I will have to get some encouraging word from my home folks.

They are not going to approve that kind of program—not while the head

of the house is hunting a job—while the family is living on unemployment benefits which will soon end—unemployment compensation, paid by the employers first and then by the people who purchase merchandise—not when the price of everything we buy is going higher. The price of food continues to go up. When you go to the store you find meat at \$1.25 a pound. Some Congressmen even cannot afford it. Maybe it is selfishness. But I am not going to vote \$4 million for the Olympic games. No. Even though because of refusing I am called a conservative tightwad. I would rather see people eat than run a footrace in a stadium in California much as I love that State and its people.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman will state it.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, has all time expired?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair informs the gentlewoman from Massachusetts that all time has expired.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The motion was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. Out of moneys appropriated by Congress for the specific purpose, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to advance to the Organizing Committee, VIII Olympic Winter Games, Squaw Valley, Calif., U. S. A. 1960, Inc., a nonprofit corporation of the State of California, at its request, funds to construct, on land of the United States in Squaw Valley, Placer County, Calif., a sport arena suitable for the conduct of sports and appropriate ceremonies in connection with the VIII Olympic Winter Games. Funds so advanced by the Secretary of Defense shall not exceed estimated requirements for expenditures for the ensuing 2-month period from the date of the request. As completed, the arena becomes the property of the United States. The expenditure of such funds by the committee is subject to such audit and control as the Comptroller General of the United States may prescribe.

SEC. 3. On or before April 1, 1960, any lease by the United States of the property on which the arena authorized by section 2 is located shall be reviewed and lease occupancy thereafter shall include a fair and appropriate rental reflecting the added value and utility represented by the arena.

SEC. 4. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$500,000 to carry out the purposes of section 1 and not to exceed \$3,500,000 to carry out the purposes of section 2 of this act.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore [Mr. McCORMACK] having assumed the chair, Mr. NATCHER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (S. 3262) to authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for

other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 516, he reported the bill back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I demand the reading of the engrossed copy.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The engrossed copy is at the desk. Does the gentleman want to have it read?

Mr. GROSS. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the engrossed copy of the bill.

The bill was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 218, nays 102, not voting 109, as follows:

[Roll No. 37]

YEAS—218

Addonizio	Eberharter	Kearney
Albert	Edmondson	Keating
Alger	Elliott	Kee
Allen, Ill.	Fascell	Kilday
Anderson,	Feighan	Kling
Mont.	Fenton	Kirwan
Aspinall	Fisher	Kitchin
Auchincloss	Flood	Landrum
Ayres	Forand	Lane
Bailey	Ford	Lankford
Baker	Forrester	Lesinski
Baldwin	Fountain	Libonati
Bass, Tenn.	Frazier	Lipscomb
Bates	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy
Beamer	Friedel	McCormack
Becker	Fulton	McFall
Beckworth	Gathings	McGovern
Bennett, Fla.	Gavin	McIntire
Bennett, Mich.	Glenn	McIntosh
Blatnik	Granahan	McMillan
Blitch	Green, Oreg.	Machrowicz
Boggs	Gregory	Mack, Ill.
Bolling	Gubser	Mahon
Boykin	Hagen	Maillard
Boyle	Halleck	Martin
Bray	Harden	Matthews
Breeding	Hardy	May
Brooks, Tex.	Harris	Marrow
Broomfield	Harrison, Va.	Metcalf
Brown, Ga.	Harvey	Michel
Brown, Mo.	Hays, Ohio	Miller, Calif.
Bush	Hébert	Mills
Byrne, Pa.	Heseltun	Mitchell
Canfield	Hess	Montoya
Carrigg	Hlestand	Morano
Chamberlain	Hill	Morris
Chelf	Hillings	Moss
Chenoweth	Holifield	Multer
Coffin	Holland	Natcher
Corbett	Holmes	Nicholson
Cretella	Holt	Nimtz
Curtin	Holtzman	O'Brien, N. Y.
Dague	Horan	O'Hara, Minn.
Davis, Tenn.	Hosmer	O'Neill
Dellay	Huddleston	Osmers
Denton	Hull	Ostertag
Devereux	Hyde	Patman
Dingell	Ikard	Patterson
Dixon	Jackson	Pelly
Donohue	Jarman	Perkins
Dooley	Jennings	Pfost
Dorn, N. Y.	Johnson	Phillbin
Dorn, S. C.	Jones, Ala.	Pilcher
Doyle	Judd	Poage
Durham	Karsten	Porter

Preston
Price
Prouty
Quile
Rabaut
Reece, Tenn.
Rhodes, Ariz.
Rhodes, Pa.
Riehlman
Riley
Roberts
Robison, Ky.
Rodino
Rogers, Colo.
Rogers, Fla.
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, Tex.
Rooney

Sadlak
Santangelo
Saund
Saylor
Scudder
Seely-Brown
Selden
Shelley
Shuford
Sisk
Smith, Calif.
Smith, Miss.
Stauffer
Steed
Suillvan
Teague, Calif.
Tewes
Thompson, N. J.
Zablocki

Thompson, Tex.
Thomson, Wyo.
Thornberry
Trimble
Udall
Ullman
Utt
Vanik
Van Zandt
Vinson
Westland
Widnall
Wigglesworth
Wilson, Calif.
Withrow
Young
Younger

NAYS—102

Abernethy
Andersen,
H. Carl
Andrews
Ashmore
Avery
Bass, N. H.
Baumhart
Belcher
Bentley
Berry
Betts
Bow
Brown, Ohio
Brownson
Broyhill
Budge
Burlison
Byrne, Ill.
Byrnes, Wis.
Cannon
Cederberg
Church
Clevenger
Coad
Cunningham,
Iowa
Curtis, Mass.
Davis, Ga.
Dowdy
Everett
Flynt
George
Gray
Griffin

Gross
Haley
Harrison, Nebr.
Hemphill
Henderson
Herlong
Hoeven
Hoffman
Jenkins
Jensen
Johansen
Jonas
Jones, Mo.
Kean
Kearns
Kilburn
Kilgore
Knox
Laird
LeCompte
Loser
McCulloch
McGregor
McVey
Macdonald
Mack, Wash.
Marshall
Mason
Meader
Miller, Md.
Miller, Nebr.
Minshall
Mumma
Murray
Neal

Norblad
Norrell
O'Konski
Pillion
Poff
Polk
Rees, Kans.
Robison, N. Y.
Rutherford
Schenck
Scherer
Schwengel
Scott, N. C.
Scrivner
Sheehan
Sikes
Silar
Simpson, Ill.
Smith, Kans.
Springer
Taber
Talle
Thomas
Van Pelt
Vursell
Watts
Weaver
Wharton
Whitener
Whitten
Wler
Williams, Miss.
Williams, N. Y.
Winstead

NOT VOTING—109

Abbitt
Adair
Alexander
Allen, Calif.
Anfuso
Arends
Ashley
Barden
Baring
Barrett
Boland
Bolton
Bonner
Bosch
Brooks, La.
Buckley
Burdick
Byrd
Carnahan
Celler
Chiperfield
Christopher
Clark
Collier
Colmer
Cooley
Coudert
Cramer
Cunningham,
Nebr.
Curtis, Mo.
Dawson, Ill.
Dawson, Utah
Delaney
Dennison
Dent
Derounian

Dies
Diggs
Dollinger
Dwyer
Engle
Evins
Fallon
Farbstein
Fino
Fogarty
Garmatz
Gary
Gordon
Grant
Green, Pa.
Griffiths
Gwinn
Hale
Haskell
Hays, Ark.
Healey
James
Kelly, N. Y.
Keogh
Kluczynski
Knutson
Krueger
Lafore
Latham
Lennon
McDonough
Madden
Magnuson
Miller, N. Y.
Moore
Morgan
Morrison

Moulder
O'Brien, Ill.
O'Hara, Ill.
Passman
Powell
Radwan
Rains
Ray
Reed
Reuss
Rivers
Robeson, Va.
Roosevelt
St. George
Scott, Pa.
Sheppard
Sléminski
Simpson, Pa.
Smith, Va.
Spence
Staggers
Taylor
Teague, Tex.
Teller
Thompson, La.
Tollefson
Tuck
Vorys
Wainwright
Walter
Willis
Wilson, Ind.
Wolverton
Wright
Yates
Zelenko

Mr. Miller of New York with Mr. Lafore.
Mr. Haskell with Mr. Scott of Pennsylvania.
Mrs. St. George with Mr. Cramer.
Mr. Sheppard with Mr. Dennison.
Mr. Engel with Mr. Coudert.
Mr. Roosevelt with Mr. Chiperfield.
Mr. Dent with Mr. Fino.
Mr. Keogh with Mr. Lennon.
Mr. Anfuso with Mr. Alexander.
Mr. Dollinger with Mr. Abbitt.
Mr. Evins with Mr. Radwan.
Mr. O'Brien of Illinois with Mr. Collier.
Mr. Yates of Illinois with Mr. Robeson of Virginia.

Mr. Celler with Mr. Cunningham of Nebraska.

Mr. Farbstein with Mr. Ray.
Mr. Teller with Mr. Colmer.
Mr. Zelenko with Mr. Tuck.
Mr. Allen of California with Mr. Krueger.
Mr. Derounian with Mr. Reed of New York.
Mr. Delaney with Mr. Curtis of Missouri.
Mrs. Kelly of New York with Mr. Vorys.
Mr. Fallon with Mr. Gwinn.
Mr. Kluczynski with Mr. Dies.
Mr. Walter with Mr. Reuss.
Mr. Healey with Mr. Smith of Virginia.
Mr. Buckley with Mr. Grant.
Mr. Green of Pennsylvania with Mr. Dawson of Utah.

Mr. Ashley with Mr. Adair.
Mr. Barrett with Mr. Tollefson.
Mr. Carnahan with Mr. Simpson of Pennsylvania.

Mr. Byrd with Mr. Hale.
Mr. Morrison with Mrs. Dwyer.
Mr. Moulder with Mr. Burdick.
Mr. Staggers with Mr. Wainwright.
Mr. Thompson of Louisiana with Mr. Wilson of Indiana.

Mr. AVERY changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. CUNNINGHAM of Iowa changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The doors were opened.

GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PEACE PROPAGANDA THROUGH SPORTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS] is recognized for 10 minutes.

(Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I was very glad to vote for the Olympic games bill when it came up under suspension of the rules, and I was very glad to vote for it today. I tried to secure interest in the bill by talking to as many Members as I could about it. We do not do enough to create the knowledge abroad amongst those people, particularly those living in Russia, that we are not warmongers, that we are in-

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Mr. McDonough with Mr. James.
Mr. Garmatz with Mr. Taylor.
Mr. Arends with Mr. Bosch.
Mr. Wolverton with Mr. Latham.
Mr. Moore with Mrs. Bolton.

terested in peaceful pursuits. I think there is no finer way of showing the people of all countries how we act and how we feel in this peace-loving and free Nation than by having them come to our country and participate in the great American sports in rivalry, if you will, or in competition, with the sportsmen and women of other countries of the world. I am delighted that the bill passed. The gracious, friendly, beautiful California will be wonderful hosts.

Mr. Speaker, I wish we could have more of what I call peace propaganda in a cold and a very unpleasant war. I ask that this be inserted just after the passage of the Olympic games bill.

ELECTION TO COMMITTEE

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 518

Resolved, That JACK WESTLAND, of Washington, be, and he is hereby, elected a member of the standing Committee of the House of Representatives on Government Operations.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DO NOT INCREASE FEDERAL SHARE OF MATCHED GRANTS FOR HIGHWAYS FROM 50-50 TO 70-30

(Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, the increase in the Federal share of matched grants for highway aid provided for in the Senate but not in the House bill, is unfair to certain sections of the country and should be opposed by the House.

Matched grants on a 50-50 basis has been the rule for many years in the provision for the ABC highways; namely, the primary, secondary, and urban highways. Appropriations have been apportioned between these three groups at 45 percent, 30 percent, and 25 percent, respectively, and the formula for distribution has been based in general one-third on population, one-third on area, and one-third on road mileage.

The bill recently passed by the House, H. R. 9821, continued this arrangement and for the ABC highways and appropriated \$900 million for 1960 and \$925 million for 1961.

The Senate has made substantially this same provision except that it reduced the \$925 million appropriation for 1961 to \$900 million.

But the Senate has added a special additional \$400 million for the ABC roads for fiscal 1959. This new money will still be apportioned as above, 45 percent to primary, 30 percent to secondary, 25 percent to urban, except that 100 percent transferability is permitted. And for this new money, the matching grant basis will be 70 percent Federal, 30 percent State.

The President recommended continuation of the ABC program on the usual basis.

It is well known that the Federal grant-in-aid system has the effect of taking tax money paid by the citizens of the various States and redistributing it on a different basis from that on which the Federal Government received it from the States. This redistribution is often justifiable when the object for which the money is granted is one of truly national interest. It is unfair to some States when the moneys is applied to more local objectives.

With unlimited transferability, this new \$400 million can be applied by some States largely to secondary roads, of which farm-to-market roads are a part. While sectional interest should not be overemphasized, the taxpayers of the more thickly populated States should not be asked to contribute indirectly on a basis of 70 percent Federal grants for this type of aid for highways of predominantly local interest.

(Mr. CURTIS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

AIRPLANE ACCIDENTS

(Mr. ROGERS of Massachusetts asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a copy of the Washington Post. The headline is "Eighteen Die as Air Force Giants Collide—All in Both Planes Die."

On the same front page the headlines read "Plane Carrying 46 Circles Airport 2 Hours With Faulty Landing Gear." This plane was making its flight from Buenos Aires, Argentina, to New York. It was obliged to land at the National Airport in Washington. Fortunately there were no casualties.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the Speaker of the House appoint a special committee to study the reasons for all of these airplane accidents, both civilian and military. Something is radically wrong. It may be sabotage and, of course, that certainly should be investigated. It may be faulty equipment or faulty policing or faulty preparations for making planes ready for flight. Whatever it is, we must remember that human life is very precious, and if we are going to lose more and more lives through accidents, particularly accidents which may be preventable, we are, indeed, in a terrible situation.

The newspaper stories follow:

EIGHTEEN DIE AS TWO AIR FORCE GIANTS COLLIDE—ALL ON BOTH BIG PLANES ARE KILLED

BRIDGEPORT, TEX., March 27.—Two huge Air Force transport planes, a C-124 Globemaster and a C-119 Flying Boxcar, collided above Bridgeport late today and plunged flaming to the ground, killing 18 men.

Both planes crashed on their backs, and there were no survivors. At 12 midnight (c. s. t.) the search for bodies was stopped until Friday. Fourteen of the 15 bodies of those aboard the Globemaster had been found and the bodies of all 3 men aboard the C-119 had been recovered.

A 15th passenger aboard the C-124 was missing and authorities said there was no doubt that he was killed.

Five of those aboard the C-124 were airborne hitchhikers—2 sailors, 2 Army men and an Air Force man.

The C-119 plunged straight down and crashed 100 yards from a farmer who was plowing in a field. He leaped from his tractor and fled but then realized that there wasn't any place to hide and stopped and watched it hit.

The pilot of the C-124 tried desperately to pull up and keep his craft aloft, but it also crashed, on the lip of a ravine, where it exploded and burned.

The C-119 was en route from Sheppard Air Force Base at Wichita Falls, Tex., to Carswell Air Force Base, near Ft. Worth. The other plane was from Hill Air Force Base, Utah, en route to Tinker Air Force Base at Oklahoma City.

The planes crashed about 2 miles apart, the nearest about a mile from Bridgeport.

Two victims of the crash were identified later by the Air Force at Ft. Worth. They were Capt. H. J. Thomas, pilot, and S. Sgt. C. T. Stagle, engineer, both aboard the C-119. Their home addresses were given as Ft. Worth.

HUNDREDS DRAWN TO SCENE—PLANE CARRYING 46 CIRCLES AIRPORT 2 HOURS WITH FAULTY LANDING GEAR

An international airliner with 46 persons aboard circled National Airport for 2 hours yesterday when the pilot feared his landing gear was jammed.

The DC-6 was landed safely at 6:56 p. m. as hundreds of spectators, drawn to the field by radio reports, watched anxiously. Police, fire companies, crash equipment, and ambulances were dispatched to the airport shortly after Eastern Airlines Capt. J. B. Thompson, of Miami, notified the control tower an indicator showed trouble in the nose wheel.

The DC-6 took off from the airport for New York at 4:56 p. m. It landed after making a low pass that revealed to the tower and company mechanics that the landing gear was down.

The Braniff airliner, operated by Eastern Airlines on the United States leg of its flight from Buenos Aires, Argentina, to New York City, had a cracked axle in the nose wheel's shock absorber, Eastern officials discovered. Another plane took the passengers to New York.

Six District fire battalion chiefs were sent to the airport. Park Police kept traffic moving on George Washington Memorial Parkway and District Police kept the 14th Street and Memorial bridges clear in the event emergency runs were necessary. Hundreds of private cars converged on the area.

Copilot Wallace Steinbring, 34, was operating the plane when the panel indicator flashed red, indicating trouble with the landing gear. Thompson piloted the plane to its landing after the tense 2 hours of circling and attempts to determine whether the nose wheel was dangerously defective.

About half the 40 passengers boarded the plane in Washington, Eastern spokesmen said. Representative COUDERT, Republican, New York, was among the passengers.

And, from their own accounts, the passengers didn't show much fear. Fourteen-year-old Anne Hildt, of New York City, said, "I wasn't scared until just before we started to land, when the captain said all the ambulances and fire engines were waiting for us down below."

DEMOCRATS IN THE SADDLE

(Mr. SILER asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point.)

Mr. SILER. Mr. Speaker, the official roster of our United States Congress shows that both of its Houses are today substantially and undeniably controlled by the Democrat Party. Likewise, all

Public Law 85-365
85th Congress, S. 3262
April 3, 1958

AN ACT

72 Stat. 78.

To authorize certain activities by the Armed Forces in support of the VIII Olympic Winter Games, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That, (a) notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of a military department may, with respect to the VIII Olympic Winter Games— 1960.

(1) permit personnel of the Armed Forces under his jurisdiction to prepare courses, fields, and rinks, maintain avalanche control, and provide communications;

(2) lend necessary equipment; and

(3) provide such other support as he considers appropriate.

(b) The Secretary of the military department concerned may spend such funds for the purposes of this section as Congress may specifically appropriate for those purposes. He may acquire and utilize such supplies, material, and equipment as he determines to be necessary to provide the support authorized by this section.

(c) The authority provided to the Secretaries of the military departments by this section is permissive and not mandatory.

SEC. 2. Out of moneys appropriated by Congress for the specific purpose, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to advance to the Organizing Committee, VIII Olympic Winter Games, Squaw Valley, California, U. S. A. 1960, Incorporated, a nonprofit corporation of the State of California, at its request, funds to construct, on land of the United States in Squaw Valley, Placer County, California, a sports arena suitable for the conduct of sports and appropriate ceremonies in connection with the VIII Olympic Winter Games. Funds so advanced by the Secretary of Defense shall not exceed estimated requirements for expenditures for the ensuing two-month period from the date of the request. As completed, the arena becomes the property of the United States. The expenditure of such funds by the Committee is subject to such audit and control as the Comptroller General of the United States may prescribe. Arena.

SEC. 3. On or before April 1, 1960, any lease by the United States of the property on which the arena authorized by section 2 is located shall be reviewed and lease occupancy thereafter shall include a fair and appropriate rental reflecting the added value and utility represented by the arena.

SEC. 4. There is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$500,000 to carry out the purposes of section 1 and not to exceed \$3,500,000 to carry out the purposes of section 2 of this Act. Appropriation.

Approved April 3, 1958.

